

CITY OF YPSILANTI
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 24, 2015

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Anne Stevenson	Chair 7:00 PM
Meeting Location:	Council Chambers, City Hall
Commissioners Present:	Hank Prebys, Jane Schmiedeke, Erika Lindsay, Michael Condon, Alex Pettit
Commissioners Absent:	Ron Rupert, Anne Stevenson
Staff Present:	Cynthia Kochanek, Associate Planner Haley McAlpine, HDC Assistant

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion:	Schmiedeke (second: Condon) moves to approve agenda as amended to include 214 N Huron as a study item.
Approval:	Unanimous. Motion carries.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS - none

PUBLIC HEARING- none

OLD BUSINESS -none

NEW BUSINESS

201 Oak St

**Application is for reroofing and can vent installation.*

Applicant:	Donald DePriest—contractor, present
------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion:	DePriest: States that he was contracted by HighScope to replace roofs on several buildings. Applicant presents contracts and states that the HDC may be concerned with the type of vents they plan to put on the roof
-------------	---

Schmiedeke: States that the HDC is also concerned with the placement of the vents.

DePriest: States that per the contract, they plan to install ridge vents along the main part of the house and a couple of can vents along the lower rear section of the house. States that there are existing can vents on the shed-

type roof on the rear of the house because ridge vents cannot be installed there.

Condon: States that the HDC understands that can vents can be necessary but they want them to be placed in way so that their visual impact is as little as possible, and so that they are not visible from the street side elevation. From the photos, it appears these can vents will be basically invisible.

Schmiedeke: Asks the applicant about the proposed color of the drip edge.

DePriest: States that the drip edge will match the shingle color, charcoal.

Condon: Asks the applicant if he intends to replace the gutters.

DePriest: States that they will not be doing any work regarding the gutters.

Motion: Condon (second: Pettit) moves for approval of the application for 201 Oak St to include roof replacement with GAF Lifetime Timberline Shingles in Charcoal, and drip edges will match the color of the shingles. The can vents should be placed such that they are not visible from the street.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

#5—Preserve distinctive features, #10—New work shall be removable

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

206 E Forest

**Application is for reroof.*

Applicant: Donald DePriest—contractor, present

Discussion: DePriest: States that they were contracted 10 years ago to do work on the original front half of the building. States that the photos show the original section of the roof is perpendicular to the street, such that the vents face the parking lot in the rear. States that they were able to use can vents in previous work. States that there are existing, large, obtrusive can vents and that he does not have a preference for either ridge vents or can vents. States that existing vents are large and round, mushroom like. States that they intend to replace them with brown, low profile, can vents to match the ones on the original roof.

Condon: Asks if the space below the roof is an attic.

DePriest: States that he was not allowed inside the property, but states there is an attic space.

Condon: Asks applicant if he plans to install low profile, traditional vents in the same location as the exiting vents.

DePriest: States that they plan to put them as close to the original locations as they can.

Condon: States that the new vents will not be visible from the street, but may be visible from the alley.

Lindsay: Asks applicant to clarify their plans—asks if they plan to replace existing mushroom-style vents with the low profile vents.

DePriest: States that that is correct.

Lindsay: States that they will look better than what is existing.

Prebys: Asks if the front part will be reroofed.

DePriest: States that they will not be reroofing the front part—they will only be doing work on the back of the roof.

Schmiedeke: Asks if drip edge will be brown.

DePriest: States that the drip edge will be brown to match the shingles.

Motion: Condon (second: Pettit) moves for the approval of the application for 206 E forest to include replacement of the existing roof with GAF Lifetime Timberline Shingles in Hickory. Drip edge will match the color of the shingles. Can vents will also match the color of the shingle and will be placed such that their visual impact is as minimal as possible.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

#5—Preserve distinctive features, #10—New work shall be removable

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

501 N Hamilton

**Application is for paint.*

Applicant: Michael Parakh—Owner, not present

Discussion: Schmiedeke: States that the applicant wants to paint the house a dark grey, with a brown trim, a red door, and ivory shutters.

Condon: States that the grey color for the propose body of the house will be the same color as the grey roof.

Lindsay: States that the shutters will look very bright white against the dark grey of the house.

Condon: Suggests that applicant may want to choose a different color for the body of the house, as it is so similar to the color of the roof.

Motion: Condon (second: Pettit) moves to approve the application for at 501 N Hamilton to include the repainting using colors as listed in the application. When prepping for paint, no power washing shall be used. If washing is required, it should be low pressure water with a soft bristle brush. After substrate is thoroughly dry, an oil-based primer should be used on bare wood, then a top coat of the latex paint in the chosen colors. The finish should be satin or eggshell. The HDC encourages the applicant to consider an alternative color choice, as the roof appears to be roughly the same color as the proposed body of the house. The light colored shutters will look very light against the dark grey.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

7-- Clean building gently—no sandblasting.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

325 E Cross

**Application is for new window sash installation*

Applicant: Deborah Harney, owner—present

Discussion: Schmiedeke: States that the paint job the applicant did on the house is spectacular.

Prebys: Asks the applicant about the windows they plan to install.

Harney: Applicant states that some of the existing windows don't open unless propped open and other windows don't open at all. States that the windows leak air and are drafty. States that the contractor she hired is listed as someone who works on historical houses, and that nothing about the window will change—not the size nor view. The new windows will not impact the house in anyway but to make it warmer.

Condon: Asks if applicant knows brand of windows to be installed.

Harney: States that she does not know. States that she thinks that the contractor is making the windows themselves—that they are a manufacturer.

Prebys: Asks for name of manufacturer.

Harney: States that it is Kelly Window and Door Manufacturing.

Condon: States that he does not see an issue with replacing window sashes with window sashes.

Harney: States they are only replacing 5 windows.

Pettit: Asks which windows will be replaced.

Harney: States that they will be replacing windows in living and dining room.

Prebys: Asks if there are any further questions.

Schmiedeke: States that the primer for exterior of window should be oil based. The finish can be latex. Clarifies that the application states that the interior of the windows will be stained.

Harney: States that she will make sure an oil based primer will be used on the exterior. States that she loves the house and that she wants to make sure it looks how it should.

Motion: Condon (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the application for 325 E Cross St to include the installation of custom fabricated wood window sashes to five windows. The new window sashes will match existing windows in profile and glazing area, and be painted to match the existing color scheme. Windows should be painted with an oil-based primer and a finish coat of latex based paint.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

#5—Preserve distinctive features, #10—New work shall be removable

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

309 N Park

**Application is for gutter installation.*

Applicant: Sarah and Raymond Anderson, owners, and Mary Wheaton—present

Discussion: Prebys: Asks what will be involved with gutter installation.

Wheaton: States there are no existing gutters on the house, and that they want to install them on house and garage. States that they have priced out gutters.

Lindsay: Asks if the color is the Cranberry color, that will match the color of the house.

Schmiedeke: Asks if there will be downspouts.

Prebys: Asks where the downspouts will be located.

Wheaton: States that they think they will be in the corners.

Sarah Anderson: States that downspouts on the garage will be put towards the middle due to the two different elevations of the garage roof.

Prebys: Asks if there are any additional questions.

Condon: Asks if the garage has two levels or if the siding is straight across. Asks if there is a corner board.

Wheaton: Asks for clarification.

Prebys: Asks if the back part of the roof is raised.

Raymond Anderson: States that that is correct.

Wheaton: States that it was a regular garage but previous owner built something behind it so that it goes up and has a copula on top.

Condon: Asks if there is a way to put downspouts at corners of garage. States that putting downspouts at the middle of the wall will not only be aesthetically unpleasing, but also you want the water to get as far away from the building as possible.

Raymond: States that he doesn't know exactly what the contractor had in mind, but that the back part of the garage sticks out further on the yard side than the other part of the garage. States that there is a joining of the two roofs by the middle spout.

Prebys: Asks about the k-style gutters they plan to install.

Condon: States he would like to see a half-round gutter. Asks if the applicant had considered a half-round gutter.

Anderson: States that they priced it out and found that the half round gutter is \$5,000 more than the k-style.

Schmiedeke: States that she likes the color choice.

Prebys: Asks how the gutters will be attached to house.

Condon: Ask if the applicant will use either be adhered with straps or blind hangers.

Wheaton: States that they are unsure. Asks if the HDC would have a preference.

Condon: States that there are a few ways gutters can be installed, and if the applicant uses hanging straps they should be placed under the shingles, not on top of the shingles. States that if the fascia is vertical, they usually use a blind gutter screw that fits inside the gutter and can't be seen from the ground. If a strap is used, the strap is visible and looks fine on the bottom of the gutter but does not look nailed to the roof of the house.

Motion: Condon (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the application at 309 N Park to include the installation of k-style gutters in Cranberry to the edge of the roof and downspouts to be placed at corners of the house and as necessary on the garage. If straps are used to attach the gutters, they should be installed underneath the shingles.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:
#10--New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

220 Pearl St

**Application is for brick repair and replacement, and tuck-pointing on planters.*

Applicant: Bill DeGruit and Reggie Whitlow, representatives—present

Discussion: Prebys: Asks the applicant to describe the proposed job of replacing the damaged brick and repointing.

DeGruit: States that they are from the Ann Arbor Transit Authority and that they operate the transit center in Ypsilanti. States that they have had a problem for the last several years finding the cap brick to replace the existing cap brick on the planter area. They have now found a quarry to match the color and style of the brick, and they now have a project to move forward replacing the brick. States that they would like to create a capstone that is more of a formed brick of limestone instead of independent brick. This is so that it can be used as somewhat of a seating area, even though that is not its intended use. The limestone will allow seating without impinging the brick as much.

Condon: Asks if they were able to find replacement brick for the pyramid cap.

DeGruit: States that they were not able to find that, which is why they are proposing a limestone cap. They are better for seating and they will be replaceable in case damage happens in the future. States they were able to find matching brick for the walls of the planters.

Condon: States that he looked over the print and everything looks fine. Suggests that since the capstones will be used as seating when people wait for the buses, and will be subject to bumping and banging of objects against them, that they may want to have a bull nose edge put on the limestone caps. It will make them more comfortable to sit on and will be less likely to chip. It may cost them an extra \$1,000. It's not required, but it may be a good idea.

DeGruit: Agrees that it's a good idea and states that he may be able to negotiate with the contractor. States that the limestone caps are pre-formed, but there is a potential of having a rounded edge.

Condon: States that the caps could be rounded after they are installed. Reiterates that it's not required but it is a good idea to have the bull nose edge on the limestone caps.

Prebys: Asks if there are other questions.

Pettit: Asks if there are grout specifications.

Condon: States that plan specifies Type N, which is common for that kind of brick.

Motion: Condon (second: Pettit) moves approval for application for 220 Pearl St as described in the application to include repointing and replacement of spalled and damaged bricks, as well as the replacement of the brick cap with the limestone cap.

Secretary of Interior Standard:

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

#7—Clean building gently—no sandblasting.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

16 N Washington

**Application is for reconstruction of corbel on front façade.*

Applicant: Piero Spraga

Discussion: Prebys: States that the scope of work states that there will be a rebuilding of the top of a corbeled wall. Asks the applicant what their plans are.

Sparga: States that they have missing bricks that are exactly the same as the existing. States that they have gone back and forth with city and that they need to know what kind of mortar mix they should be using.

Schmiedeke: Asks if they are planning on extending what is there.

Condon: Asks if Mr.Spraga is the one who completed the application.

Spraga: States that he did not—it was his contractor who could not attend the meeting.

Condon: States that he had a number of questions about the application. The application states that there will be a rebuilding of the corbel at the top of the wall, but the wall on the building is not corbelled. It's straight up and then there is a cast concrete cap on top of that. States that he does not understand the plan for work.

Prebys: States that the Commission would be more comfortable speaking with contractor directly because application is unclear and Mr.Spraga is unable to clarify.

Sparga: Asks if the HDC can give him some guidelines to pass along to his contractor.

Prebys: States that the description of work is too unclear, especially regarding the corbelling.

Condon: States that the application lists that they will use 4" solid block, but the building currently has brick, not block. States that Type N mortar is probably too hard for that type of brick, if he is using brick. States that the Commission does not want him using block, or rebuilding a corbel since

there is no corbel there. The application also states that they will "sand back wall for paint work at a later date."

Prebys: States that he does not want the contractor sandblasting the wall.

Condon: States that even sanding would be damaging to the masonry. States that they cannot move forward with the application since their questions cannot be answered.

Spraga: Asks if it would be possible to get the contractor on the phone for the Commissioners to speak to.

Prebys: States that they would need the contractor to be physically present.

Motion: Schmiedeke (second: Condon) moves to table the application pending the presence of the contractor.

Secretary of Interior Standard: N/A

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

720 Norris St

**Application is for addition of grain silo and Co2 tank on site.*

Applicant: Rene Graff and Matt Graff

Discussion: Prebys: Asks the applicants to describe the work they plan to do.

Matt: States that based on their last informal discussion with the HDC, they plan to keep silo in the south parking lot on the east side of the overhead door, and move the co2 tank from a parking space and will instead be tucked in on the east side of the building between the fence and back of building. States that the existing storage that's there will go away.

Prebys: Asks about protective coating on c02 tank.

Matt: States that they will be using powder-coating.

Prebys: Asks what color the powder-coating will be.

Matt: States that grey is the standard color. States he may not have much leeway with the company.

Lindsay: States that the grey would be neutral.

Condon: Asks if c02 tank will make noise.

Matt: States that it makes noise but only when they fill it, which would be around every two weeks or so.

Condon: Asks if the silo would make any noise.

Matt: States that the silo will not make any noise.

Pettit: Asks about the concrete work involved. Asks if it is mostly subsurface except where the silo and tank are mounted.

Matt: States that that is correct and that they have had a soil core taken, and they have loose soil. States that it is more complicated than they expected, but visually, the plans won't change.

Pettit: Asks if it will be mostly barely in the silo.

Matt: States that it will be all barely in the silo.

Pettit: Asks if the silo will be the same grey color as the Co2 tank.

Matt: States that it will not be the same color—the silo will be galvanized steel with no shiny finish.

Pettit: Asks what color the legs on the silo will be.

Matt: States that they will be grey.

Motion: Pettit (second: Lindsay) moves approval for application at 720 Norris St to include the installation of external grain silo and Co2 receiver tank to be located as shown in the drawing submitted in the application. The Co2 tank will have a grey powder coat finish; the silo itself is to be galvanized steel, unfinished besides the galvanized coating. The silo legs should be grey.

Secretary of Interior Standard:

#9-- Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material, #10-- New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

213 N Huron St

**Application is for replacement of windows*

Applicant: Jonathan Hommes—present

Discussion: Prebys: Asks the applicant to tell the commission about his plans for window replacement.

Hommes: States that he plans to replace 14 windows off the sunroom on the south side of the house. The existing windows are wooden double hung, and are in need of a lot of maintenance. States that there are external aluminum storms that were added to the house at some point. The applicant looked into the expenses and found that the sash replacement kits would be the best solution. They will be custom designed to match the existing in terms of the dimensions of the upper and slower sashes, which are slightly different heights. The upper sashes are divided and the replacement sashes will have permanent interior and exterior dividers and SDLs (simulated

divided light). It would be a double pained, argon filled window as opposed to the single pain that exists now. The sash replacement kits would also would allow tilt in for cleaning. States that he plans to remove the storms come the Spring, so that he can scrape and repaint the window frames and sills.

Prebys: Asks if the aluminum storms will be discarded after they are removed.

Hommes: States that the storms will be discarded. The new windows will have a screen.

Schmideke: Asks about dividers—states that the application states there are interior and exterior dividers.

Hommes: States that there is a divider in between the panes and a divider inside and outside the glass.

Lindsay: Asks if it will be the same pattern.

Hommes: States it will be the same pattern.

Prebys: Asks if the windows are two over one?

Hommes: States that the windows are four over one.

Condon: States that the photos show that the meeting rail on the storms doesn't match up with meeting rail on the windows.

Pettit: States that removing storms will be a good thing.

Prebys: States that the photos suggest that the windows are in rough shape.

Hommes: States that the windows definitely need to be re-glazed and repainted. States he would be concerned with doing only those repairs, as he would still have the single pane glass and would have to keep the storms to protect the windows.

Motion: Pettit (second: Condon) moves approval for work at 213 N Huron to include replacement of 14 double hung windows on the sunroom with sash replacement kits, replacement windows will have the same glazing area as the existing windows and are to replicate the existing light pattern (4 over 1) with lights that are divided at least on the outside, if not on the interior as well. Windows are to be cottage style to emulate the type of windows that are there. Windows are to be Andersen E Series Double Hung replacement kits. They are to be aluminum clad wood, and should be factory finished white. The existing storm windows will be removed as part of this project.

Secretary of Interior Standard:

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

STUDY ITEMS

214 N Huron St

**Application is for installation of a gate.*

Applicant: Cheryl Farmer—present

Discussion: Farmer: States that she has found a gate that she would like to install in the front of her house as a piece of art. States that the gate would be permanently swung open and would be placed on the walkway in front of the house, where the main sidewalk meets her walkway. States that the gate is 4'x6'.

Prebys: Asks the applicant where she would place the gate.

Farmer: States that she wants to put it where the apron on the front walkway begins to narrow down. States that there is no fence going up, but that the gate will be swung open.

Lindsay: Asks applicant what she will hinge the gate to.

Farmer: States that she would hinge the gate to a 4x4 treated wooden post.

Condon: States that he might like to see the post be metal.

Farmer: States that the gate is very heavy.

Condon: Suggests that the applicant use a block or a prop to support the gate being held open, such that the weight of the gate doesn't pull on the post, causing it to lean or torque.

Condon: States that a metal post, like a 2'x2' steel beam planted in concrete, and painted black, it may be less distracting than the wooden post. States that Van Buren Steel or Alro Steel may have the post she is looking for.

Prebys: Asks the applicant if the post would be planted in concrete, and if the post will have a cap. Asks how tall the side of the gate is.

Farmer: States that in the center, the gate is 6'. On the sides, it is around 4.5'.

Prebys: Asks commission how far into the ground the concrete should be for the gate.

Condon: States that it should be 43" into the ground, so that it is below the frost line. With an 8' or 9' post.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

202 E Forest

Discussion: Staff administratively approved the reroof at this address.

Motion: Schmiedeke (second: Condon) moves acceptance of the administrative approval for the reroof at 202 E Forest.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

209 Oak St

Discussion: Staff administratively approved the reroof at this address.

Motion: Schmiedeke (second: Condon) moves acceptance of the administrative approval for the reroof at 209 Oak St.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

OTHER BUSINESS –none

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS –none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of November 10, 2015

Motion: Pettit (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the minutes from the November 10, 2015 meeting.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:08 pm