CITY OF YPSILANTI

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES OF March 12, 2019

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Mike Davis, Jr.	Chair 7:04 PM
Meeting Location:	Riverside Arts Center, 76 N Huron St, Ypsilanti, MI 48197
Commissioners Present:	Mike Davis, Jr., Jane Schmiedeke, Hank Prebys, Anne Stevenson, Erika Lindsay
Commissioners Absent:	Alex Pettit, Ron Rupert
Staff Present:	Scott Slagor, Preservation Planner

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Staff: Added study item 104 S Huron to agenda.

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moved to approve the agenda as submitted, with the addition of 104 S Huron to the study items.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS—none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS

301 Maple

**Window replacement.*

Applicant: Paul Manion, contractor – Present
Adriaan and Paula VanVelden, owners – Present

Discussion: Manion: Stated that the property owners are looking to replace 13 windows and add window on the east elevation of the house where there was none previously. New windows will be insert replacement windows, placed within the existing frames. The existing sashes will be removed as well as interior stops. The windows will be installed from the exterior of the house. A slight aluminum trim will be used to cover the blind stop only. Existing exterior trim will remain. Current aluminum storm windows will be removed permanently. New windows will have screens.

Schmiedeke: Asked if there will be a reduction in glass size.

Manion: Glass size is to be very similar to the aluminum storms that are there now. The new window glass will be slightly smaller than the existing window sash, but not a change from what can be seen now behind the storm windows. Therefore, no change in visible glass from the exterior.

Stevenson: Asked for clarification that there will be a reduction in glass.

Manion: Confirmed.

Stevenson: Stated concern for the reduced glass size.

Davis: Asked for an estimate of how much glass will be reduced.

Manion: Stated about an inch total on the width and inch total on the height.

Prebys: Stated he has no problem with the insert of the new window from the exterior, however he was concerned that the inserts will cause a reduction in glass size.

Manion: Stated that the proposed replacement windows would be nearly identical to those approved at 114 N River Street, which were installed last year with Marvin inserts that resulted in a slight reduction in glass size. New windows at 301 Maple will be trimmed the same as 114 N River. Photo is provided in the agenda packet.

Davis: Stated that repair versus replacement of windows is something that the commission always considers and discusses, and for this property, whether the reduction in glass is appropriate.

Stevenson: Asked if there were photos documenting the condition of the current windows.

Adriaaan VanVelden: Stated that for the most part the windows are inoperable.

Stevenson: Asked that while the windows are inoperable, are they savable? With repair, they could become operable again.

Paula VanVelden: Stated that she cannot operate the current windows when her husband is not there to help her because of a physical condition with her right hand.

[Discussion re: window color]

Manion: Confirmed the new windows will be white.

Schmiedeke: Asked to see the sample window Manion brought to the meeting.

[Discussion re: sample window in relation to proposed new windows]

Davis: Asked if the proposed windows were installed, could they easily be replaced by a future home-owner who wanted to restore the full extent of the glass.

Manion: Stated that the existing window frames will remain in-place, making it possible to remove the sashes to make future changes.

Lindsay: State concern that the new frame from the inserted windows causes an additional reduction in glass, as does the new proposed mullion pattern [new windows proposed as two-over-two].

[Discussion re: the proposed window mullion pattern]

Paula VanVelden: Stated that another problem with the windows is that they ice over in the window and cannot be seen through.

Davis: Asked Manion if he could do one-over-one windows.

Manion: Confirmed.

[Discussion re: the proposed window mullion pattern and reduction of glass; comparing the windows at 114 N River to the sample window provided by Manion]

Lindsay: Asked if the applicants had considered a sash pack to repair the windows.

Adriaan Van Velden: Stated that a sash pack would not provide them with the quality windows they need, as the current windows breath like there is no glass.

Davis: Stated that to move forward with the application, maybe the commission could stipulate that the replacement windows be one-over-one as they are currently.

Adriaan VanVelden: Stated that one-over-one windows are only used on part of the house as some windows are six-over-six.

Stevenson: Stated that two-over-one might be appropriate for this house but isn't sure if two-over-two would be.

Paula VanVelden: Stated she conducted thorough research of other houses in the neighborhood and found that two-over-two windows have been used in houses of a similar style.

Davis: Stated that the issue is not so much the style of the window but the reduction of glass a two-over-two window would cause.

[Discussion re: the proposed window mullion pattern and screen removal, and comparison to 114 N River]

Prebys: Asked about the stability of fiberglass-clad wood windows.

Manion: Stated that fiberglass is one of the most stable window products available because it expands and contracts at the same rate as the glass itself.

[Discussion re: the proposed window warranty and longevity as well as the window cladding, style]

Paula VanVelden: Stated that the house next-door has two-over-two windows.

Prebys: Stated that the applicant's house has gone through many phases of alterations, including the windows. However, unless we can prove what the windows originally were, then we are being creative.

[Discussion re: the window style, in comparison to neighborhood, historical photos, and period of interpretation for the house]

Davis: Stated that the glass reduction should be minimized as much as possible and reiterated that the commission would consider one-over-one or two-over-one, but not two-over-two.

Davis: Asked commission their opinion of the proposed new window on the east elevation.

Schmiedeke: Stated the addition of the new window would be an improvement.

[Discussion re: the Commission reviewed colors, and screens, and removal of storm windows]

Motion: Stevenson (second: Schmiedeke) moved to approve and issue a certificate of appropriateness for the replacement of 13 windows proposed in the application submitted on February 20, 2019 with Marvin Integrity fiberglass-clad wood windows in white. The motion also approves installation of one new window in the east elevation as specified in the application. New windows are to match the size, spacing, and alignment of the extant windows so as to not interrupt the rhythm of fenestration openings. The new windows are to match as close as possible to the Marvin Integrity windows installed at 114 N River Street that were included as a photo in the submission packet. The property owners can decide if they want one-over-one or two-over-one windows.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:
#2- Do not destroy original character.
#9 - Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carried.

[Discussion re: The Commission explained to the applicants the process of future proposals and paint colors.]

29 E. Cross
**Repair and repaint of fire escape.*

Applicant: Gary and Carolyn McKeever, owners – Present

Discussion: Gary McKeever: State the work is required by the city and it took four months to find an architect willing to prepare drawings.

[Discussion re: The architect.]

Gary McKeever: Stated that the goal of the project is to repair the deteriorating wood.

Stevenson: Asked to clarify if they were changing anything about the fire escape or if the repair will be with in-kind materials and like-paint color.

Gary McKeever: One structural support needs to be replaced but it will be done in the same material and painted the same color.

Davis: Asked about the screening provided on the railings, related to building code.

Gary McKeever: Confirmed.

[Discussion re: The age of the fire escape, posts, and balusters]

Motion: Stevenson (second: Schmiedeke) moved to approve and issue a notice to proceed for the work at 29 E. Cross for the repainting of the fire escape staircase on the north elevation in dark green, as it is currently, and replacement of deteriorated structural materials in kind with treated lumber as needed.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:
#6 – Repair don't replace. Replacements shall match original.
#9 – Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carried.

[Discussion re: The applicants discussed maintenance and painting of windows.]

32-42 N Huron
**Replacement of parapet capstone.*

Applicant: Michael Condon, contractor – Present

Discussion: Condon: Stated that the project includes replacement of the parapet capstone as the current one is disintegrating and blowing pieces into the street.

Prebys: Asked for clarification of materials.

Condon: Stated the new capstone will be precast concrete as it is currently.

Motion: Stevenson (second: Prebys) moved to approve and issue a certificate of appropriateness for the work at 32-42 N. Huron for the replacement of the façade parapet coping with a precast concrete capstone to match the original in size and dimension.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:
#5 – Preserve distinctive features.
#6 – Repair don't replace. Replacements shall match original.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carried.

330 E Forest
**Repair/replacement of windows and porch components.*

Applicant: Michael Condon, contractor – Present

Discussion: Condon: Stated that not all windows will be replaced, just the non-functional ones. On the north elevation these include the western-most windows; east elevation: all windows on the first floor; south elevation: eastern-most bank of three windows and a window that is in the closet; west elevation northern-most window.

Stevenson: Asked if new windows will be one-over-one to match the current.

Condon: Confirmed.

Stevenson: Asked if there is a frame on the porch skirting.

Condon: Stated that he believes there is a frame present that has been buried over the years and proposes installing a frame when the skirting is replaced. He also suggested a skirt with lattice that ran horizontally and vertically, rather than diagonally.

Condon: Stated that the tongue-and-groove decking he has replaced over the years in Douglas fir rots after 10 years because it has wider growth rings than historic wood. He also stated that the commission had previously approved synthetic decking. For this property Azek synthetic decking is proposed and Condon brought samples.

[Discussion: re: decking brand, longevity, and texture.]

Stevenson: Asked to clarify what a code compliant cedar railing would be.

Condon: Stated that code compliant would be 36 inches off the ground, while the current railing is only 30 inches.

[Discussion: re: railing height and balustrade options.]

Stevenson: Asked which color of decking would be used.

Condon: Stated that it has not been decided, but both options are gray.

Motion: Stevenson (second: Lindsay) moved to approve and issue a certificate of appropriateness for the work at 330 E Forest for the replacement of nine windows with Jeld Wen solid wood one-over-one double-hung sashes, repair of sills, replacement of porch railing with a 36-inch code compliant cedar railing that the contractor will make compatible with the original, replacement of tongue-and-groove porch decking with Azek vintage collection decking in gray, and replacement porch skirting, which is to be framed. Columns and other structural components of the porch may be repaired and replaced as necessary.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:
#2 - Do not destroy original character.
#5 – Preserve distinctive features.
#6 – Repair don't replace. Replacements shall match original.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carried.

Schmiedeke: Asked Condon what is considered low pressure in pressure washing.

Condon: Stated that Usually under 200 PSI. It depends on what is being washed.

512 N Hamilton
**Roof replacement.*

Applicant: Alexandra Mrozek, owner – Present

Discussion: Mrozek: Stated that Thundervents [can vents] will be used in the roof replacement and brought photo examples of the vents.

Davis: Asked to clarify which elevation the vents would be going on.

Mrozek: Stated that they would be used on the roof and it would be visible. The contractor did not state which side of the house they will be installed.

[Discussion: re: location of thunder vents and potential for ridge vents.]

Mrozek: Contractor said the ridge vent would not work as well as can vents because the house does not have cathedral ceilings, but ridge vents could be installed.

Stevenson: Asked why the drip edge is white when the trim of the house is tan.

Mrozek: Stated that the proposed drip edge is to match paint colors approved by the HDC that have not been applied yet.

[Discussion: re: ridge vents vs. can vents.]

Stevenson: Stated that because the house has a simple gable roof, the ridge vent across the top will work well when paired with the existing vents in the attic gables. Because there are not multiple roof lines, ridge vents will work.

Mrozek: Stated there is a rear addition that is lower.

Stevenson: Stated the addition will have separate ventilation, possibly can vents.

Davis: Stated that ridge vents will save money because you will not have to cut into the roof.

[Discussion: re: ridge vents vs. can vents on the primary structure and rear addition]

Motion: Stevenson (second: Prebys) moved to approve and issue a certificate of appropriateness for the work at 512 N Hamilton for replacement of the roof with imperial black Thunderguard shingles, black flashing, a white drip edge to match the upcoming paint colors, a ridge vent on the primary two-story section of the building and Thunder vents, if necessary, may be used on the rear one-story section of the building.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:
#9 – Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material.
#10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carried.

Mrozek: Asked what the next steps were following approval.

[Discussion: The process going forward]

STUDY ITEMS—

312 N River

Applicant: Corrine Sikorski, business representative
Jan Culbertson, Contractor
Paul Manion, contractor

Discussion: Sikorski and Culbertson: Provided drawings of the proposed changes to three sets of façade doors at 308-312 N River

104 S Huron

Applicant: Katie Bertcher, University of Michigan Student
Dhruv Tatke, University of Michigan Student
Dave Strenski, Solar Ypsi

Discussion: Applicants provided photos and schematic of proposed twelve-panel solar array for the south slope of a rear section of the building at 104 S Huron.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS—none

OTHER BUSINESS

HDC Fact Sheet Updates (Demolition, Porches, Signs, and Windows)

None.

Discussion of Administrative Approvals

[Discussion: re: what application items staff should approve administratively and how to handle dangerous buildings, and vacant building on N. Grove Street]

Staff: Will begin to make recommendations for updating what work can be approved administratively. Staff will also investigate the status of vacant buildings.

Property Monitoring
311 N River

Stevenson: Sign has come up without approval.

Staff: Will investigate.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS –none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of January 22, 2019

Motion: Prebys (second: Stevenson) moved to approve the minutes of February 26, 2019.

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 8:55 p.m.