



MINUTES

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

Tuesday, December 10, 2019
7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Alex Pettit Interim Chair 7:00 PM

Commissioners Present: Alex Pettit, Hank Prebys, Ron Rupert, Amy Swift

Commissioners Absent: Anne Stevenson, Erika Lindsay

Staff Present: Scott Slagor, Preservation Planner

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Rupert (second: Prebys) moved to approve the agenda as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS- none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS

422 N Hamilton

**Demolition by Neglect Consideration*

Owner: Karl Staffeld, present.

Staffeld: Summarized HDC approvals from November 26, 2019. Stated that the necessary permits were released by the Building Department and they have started work. Stated that the vegetation outside of the building was removed. Interior work included straightening the building using chains and showed photos. Stated that one corner has been straightened and another is still out of plumb; but will be fully corrected when the king truss is installed. Has a quote to re-roof the building and permits are in-place. Indicated he is planning on continuing work over the next two weeks

Swift: Asked what the roof material will be.

Staffeld: Indicated the outbuilding roof will match the roof of the house, a dimensional shingle that was approved on November 26, 2019.

Prebys: Stated he is pleased to hear activity that has taken place, which is a step in the right direction.

Prebys: Asked how to proceed.

[Discussion of appropriate motion]

Swift: Asked the applicant when they planned to have the work completed.

Staffeld: Replied a month to month and a half.

Swift: Asked the commission if there should be a checkup after the work is complete?

[Monitoring Discussion}

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) Move to state that the outbuilding at 422 N Hamilton appears to no longer in danger of Demolition by Neglect, however the commission wishes to maintain review of the building and asks the owner to revisit the commission at first meeting in February.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

32-42 N Huron

**Boulder Retaining Wall.*

Applicant: Lary Yapp, owner- present.

Discussion: Yapp: Indicated this is an after the fact application, as there were some questions as to where a permit was required. Now that he knows a permit is required, he is submitting for approval. The goal was to make the appearance similar to what was there before, green and unruly, but that was not possible economically and because of the borings taken revealed it was not going to be possible to sink either steel pilings or build a concrete retaining wall. Either of those options would have been destructive to parking lot, requiring installation of dead men, which would have taken out parking lot and had years of settling. He opted for boulder stones and to do the best he could with landscaping.

Prebys: asked how the drainage is dealt with.

Yapp: Indicated the drainage did not change at all. There is drainage in the center of the parking lot, French drains that have pipes going in multiple direction. If they fill up, there is a spillway that comes out of a pipe.

Pettit: Asked if any of the new grading is toward the wall.

Yapp: Stated the grading is toward the drainage.

Prebys and Rupert: [Complimentary discussion on the appearance]

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) Move to issue a Notice to Proceed for work already completed at 32-42 N Huron, as submitted in the application dated November 18, 2019, for construction of a boulder retaining wall with landscaping.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

209 Pearl

**Awning and gate.*

Applicant: Mark Maynard, owner, present.
Daniel Kelnotic, business owner, present

Discussion: Maynard: Stated he had come to the HDC on two other occasions regarding renovation of the property, including redoing historic windows and installing doors into the alley, which was approved. The HDC also approved cement removal with guidance on stamping. To-date the historic windows had been rebuilt and reinstalled, and the cement has been cut. The subject application revisits a study item from a year ago, including a fabric awning and a gate at the front of the alley space, behind the front door. Stated he will eventually come back to the HDC discuss signage.

Swift: Asked if the gate will be operable or static.

Maynard: Indicated it will be movable per Fire Department request that it be on hinges so they could get through if they had to. The Fire Department would like to have access, even though the space it is too narrow for a truck. The Fire Department will have a key in case they need access.

Swift: Asked for clarification of the awning in the photo.

Maynard: Confirmed and stated that the awning has a square front panel and will be angled behind. [References other photos].

Rupert: Asked to confirm that the awning is canvas.

Maynard: Confirmed.

[Awning material discussion]

Rupert: Asked to confirm that the framework will be secured to the building.

Maynard: Confirmed. Awning will be secured to the building in the mortar, not the brick. Will be freestanding and not touching the next-door building.

Petit: Asked if the structure cantilevers.

Maynard: Stated there are posts supporting the awning.

Pettit: Asked the color of the fabric.

Maynard: Stated it is off-white.

Kelnotic: Confirmed canvas brand and model number.

Pettit: Asked to confirm where sign will go on awning.

Maynard: Confirmed the schematic- on face of awning.

Swift: Asked about lighting.

Maynard: Indicated they will return with an application for awning lighting.

[Discussion of timeline]

Swift: Asked to clarify awning height in relation to second story windows.

Maynard: Aim to miss the windows, believes the height is 10 to 13 feet.

Swift: Asked to confirm sill to awning.

Maynard: Indicated that he does not believe the awning is higher than 13 feet, but knows the second story windows are taller than that.

Swift: Asked to make sure the awning does not interact with upper story windows.

Maynard: Does not think it would be, and there is a lot of clearance.

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) Move to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work proposed at 209 Pearl, as submitted in the application dated November 19, 2019, for installation of a boxed awning and gate at the east elevation of the building. The awning and gate structures shall be mounted to the building's mortar joints to the greatest extent possible. The awning is to be of a white canvas material.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

#10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried

[Discussion of restaurant plans]

100 W Michigan

**Applicant amended application to include only masonry work and window infill.*

Applicant: Conor Doran, project manager –present.

[Commissioners commented on the improved appearance of the building.]

Discussion: Doran: Suggested leading with the drawing submitted with the application in the packet.
[Passed out photos to show current condition of some of the windows].

Swift: Asked if the original jambs were altered by the vinyl windows.

Doran: Stated that the problem with the vinyl windows is they are sticking out at the level of the former cladding. Inquired if economically -they can be saved for now, but jambs on all windows are rotted and in bad shape.

Staff: suggested going item by item on the staff review.

[Discuss windows first]

Doran: Indicated that the shop-front at 100 W Michigan has to be removed because of the work in the corner on the foundation. There is a single beam across the shop front that is sagging and needs to be replaced. Hoping to replace the exterior facing with dark bronze aluminum. Will probably do 102 W Michigan side of the building as well, which is not necessary structurally but would be better aesthetically. Also hoping to replace façade vinyl windows with matching dark bronze aluminum-framed standard rectangular windows with no great detail.

Prebys: Asked if the windows would be double-hung.

Doran: Stated that no, the windows would be solid glass.

Rupert: Asked if the windows would be casement.

Swift: Asked if the windows would be fixed with divided lights or one single pane.

Doran: Confirmed the windows will be one single fixed light.

Swift: Inquired about original windows.

Slagor: Confirmed from photos that the original windows were similar to extant windows on the east elevation.

[Discussion of original arched openings]

Doran: The façade windows have rebuilt jambs to be square within the arch. Indicated that the goal is to keep the arch but recess the window within the arch, so the arch is still visible.

[Continued discussion of original arched openings and jambs, and original window glazing pattern]

Swift: Interpreted that there are two scenarios of the extant windows: a scenario where the original windows have been encased and although existing, are in poor condition; and a scenario on the front where there are non-original windows in altered jambs that need structural work because they were built out to the façade that had been removed. There are two approaches that need to be discussed, first the condition of the vinyl windows with a new jambs and what to do. Second is the original/existing windows in their original construction.

Rupert: Asked to discuss vinyl windows first. Indicated his feeling was there was an opportunity to replicate what was originally there.

Doran: Stated that replication windows are not economical. If they are forced to replicate wood windows or windows with divided lights, it will stop the project because they do not have the money to do that.

Swift: Indicated that there is a fair level of leeway for existing non-compliant material already in place, as opposed to new work that is not in compliance. The HDC cannot give authority to recreate work that is not in compliance, while grandfathered work is easier to approve. For the applicant to put new windows in and with the amount of work needed to put new windows in, they need to be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards. Asked applicant if that made sense.

Doran: Replied, that they need to know what they [the standards] are. Indicated they originally priced something more appropriate but came in over \$200,000, which would blow them out of the water. What they are proposing, with the storefronts, is coming in closer to \$65-70,000.

Swift: Asked if that quote was just for the front façade windows.

Doran: Asked to discuss the elevations separately.

Pettit: Indicated he does not have a clear picture of what was being proposed for the south elevation (façade). Asked for clarification.

Doran: Referenced color-coded drawing [staff provided original and referenced the packet]. On east elevation, they would replicate what they're doing on the façade for the first two bays (south to north). The third and fourth bays masonry need to be demolished and rebuilt. Trying to replicate the openings on those bays would be extremely costly. Stated they would like to brick the whole bays.

Swift: Asked to clarify that the entire four openings would go away.

Doran: Confirmed. [Referenced yellow/orange area on drawing.]

Doran: Indicated bays 5 and 6 would replicate façade windows and remaining bays would be bricked up as they do not provide light into the building. They are going into stairways, bathrooms, closets, etc. Stated the HDC approved something similar on the north of the building when the elevator shaft was completed. [Referenced brick sample]. Stated eventually everything would be painted.

Rupert: Asked to confirm the openings that would be retained vs. the openings that will be infilled.

Doran: Confirmed.

Swift: Stated her concern was that the proposed window changes are on main facades, while the previously approved infill was on the alley façade; and the proposed changes affects a lot of windows.

Doran: Asked the commission to consider that before the cladding was removed, there was only two windows on that side of the building.

Swift/Prebys: Acknowledged.

Prebys: Asked about the arched openings on east elevations.

Doran: Stated they could replicate a wood or brick infill.

[Discussed arched openings on east elevation]

Doran: [Reviewed the photos and drawings with the commission]

Swift: Asked to confirm that there are a variety of conditions present.

Doran: Confirmed.

[Continued review of photos]

Doran: Indicated another issue with the windows is the building's interior framing. The wood frame inside the building is on a new foundation that supports the building. The masonry is no longer the structural support. In order to reveal a window in the masonry, they must work around the internal wood framing. It is very involved, which is why they do not want to do that for the rooms that do not need windows.

Rupert: Indicated he had no problem bricking up windows, recessing the brick, and leaving the arch as it matches the back. It shows that in the past there were windows or doors present.

Doran: There has been some patchwork brick infill already.

Rupert: Referenced drawing and suggested to retain door opening reveal in brick.

Rupert: Indicated the commission may be in agreement on infill, but need to come to an agreement on how to treat the windows.

Swift: Disagreed. Stated that they needed to discuss more the number of windows to be infilled. Confirmed that brick recess is appropriate, but needed to discuss the amount of windows that will not be reopened.

Rupert: Indicated that the windows could be unbricked and reopened in the future.

Swift: Asked to discuss the visual impact and acknowledged that there has not been windows on that elevation for many years, however it would impact more than 50% of the façade, so it should be discussed.

Pettit: Indicated that the changes to the inside may affect exterior considerations. The windows uncovered have not seen the light of day in decades, and if not for this work, they would not be having the conversation. Stated that the applicant was not required to remove the cladding. Indicated understanding that the pattern would change.

Swift: Indicated concern that there is extant original material that they would be authorizing the removal of in order to brick in.

Pettit: Stated that some windows are altered.

Swift: Affirmed. Stated that the ones that they do have, she would like to think very clearly about the decision to approve when they are the only remaining windows in that structure that could be used as a template for future work. Once they are gone, there would be no template to redo.

[Discussion removal of original windows]

Doran: Stated there would be no way to preserve them and make them function.

Rupert: Stated that preserving original windows was achieved across the street [101 W Michigan]. They were even worse as they were exposed.

Swift: Stated that where there is evidence of original windows that they think through the choices.

Doran: Stated they could try and keep the windows for future reference.

Swift: Asked to see the photo.

Doran: Stated that the interior photos are challenging to take because of the framing.

[Review of photos provided in engineering and staff reports].

Swift: Marked her copy of the reports with what she believed to be original window fabric.

[Discussion of window infill and visual balance and photos].

Swift: Indicated that in her opinion, in the instances where there are rebuilt jambs, they can give some leeway if they discuss areas where there is original windows and original visual design. Acknowledged higher cost. Asked if there was a middle ground that could be reached.

Doran: Stated that they asked three glazers and was not able to find anyone who would even consider working on the original windows. Stated he is happy to get that in writing.

Swift: Asked about the contractor who worked on 101 W Michigan.

Doran: Stated they asked the mason but not the glazer.

Slagor: Asked Doran to elaborate on discussions they had regarding the structural compromises to the original windows because of the structural instability of the masonry.

Doran: Confirmed. The closer to the side [corner] it is, the greater the structural compromises and is probably why many windows are broken because of settling.

Rupert: Stated it was the same problem with the Thompson Building [400 N River].

Swift: Indicated she does not believe that the proposed solution for the windows meets the Secretary of the Interior Standards and is trying to find a trade-off so the commission has some of what they need- a compliant window solution, so they can preserve some of the character of the structure.

Doran: Affirmed that he understood. Stated that windows present are beyond salvageable. Indicated he would not like a patchwork solution where some are replaced but not others.

Swift: Stated the proposed solution is a patchwork of replacement and infill. Not saying that they need to preserve existing windows materially, but need to visually.

Slagor: Asked HDC if the same visual rhythm could be achieved through painting the infilled openings.

Swift: Stated that the double jamb of the original windows have shadow lines and a different visual affect than even one-over-one windows with muntins. Indicated concern for retaining that affect. Stated there is an opportunity to honor some of the character that was discovered.

Doran: Stated that they were hoping to unveil something pristine, but that did not happen. Stated that they are spending a lot of money to restore original lead-framed shop front window on the façade. Also going to preserve "Landy's Furniture" sign in a neutral color. They are looking to keep as much character as possible, but it went from a \$600,000 project to a \$1.6 million. The bank is only willing to lend \$1.1 million. Is hoping the commission will factor in economic concerns.

Swift: Stated that for the HDC to factor in economic concerns, they would need to see the bids, identify the costs of certain solutions, and what the barriers are to doing certain approaches.

Pettit: Stated the HDC needs to provide better guidance, as it is possible to identify some better options.

Swift: Asked Doran who they had review the windows.

Doran: Stated he did not know off-hand but could get that information.

Swift: Asked if they were looked at by someone who does not just sell new windows.

Doran: Asked the glazer who was doing the shop front window, with the intention to have him repair. The glazer determined that it was not feasible. Stated he could get bids from others.

Swift: Stated she would like to see a specific contractor come and look at the windows.

Slagor: Stated that the HDC is not allowed to recommend or ask for specific professionals.

[Discussion of the importance of historic windows]

Doran: Stated they are under a huge time crunch. There is a mason lined up for tomorrow-pending approval. There is potential that if they cannot work within budget, the project will stop.

Swift: Reaffirmed the HDC would like to find a solution within the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

Doran: Asked what those standards are in regards to this project.

Pettit: Stated that preserve original materials paramount. The HDC includes professionals who are familiar with preserving damaged materials and have done site visits in past. There are times when those materials can be repaired. Farther down the list is to replace like-with-like.

Prebys: Expressed concern for precedent setting with this building.

Swift: Indicated that the HDC has to make sure there is due cause for replacement of historic materials that are existing. The building has lots of openings that has cause for replacements, but ultimately they do generally need to be like-for-like. Since there are openings where there are unoriginal materials, there is nothing you're replacing that is like the original.

Doran: Expressed that he feels the HDC is not trying to compromise and is not factoring in the whole vision of the project to rehab a cornerstone downtown building and the money that is going into it. Understands that the HDC must look beyond the cost of preservation but it is just not economical and if something is not done the building will just sit.

Swift: Stated that with the uncovering of original elements, the HDC must discuss what was there as it was part of the original design theory.

Pettit: Expressed that he does not have a clear picture of what the final product would look like and that an image would aid the HDC with making a decision. There is no rendering as to what the windows and treatment of the entire façade will look like. The cut sheets are not enough to show the rhythm of the façade. A rendering is typical from applicants. Asked if a rendering was possible to produce.

Doran: Stated he is not sure if a rendering would be possible. There is a timing issue and he is not sure if that can be put together.

Swift: Asked to propose options to price out so the HDC can understand ramifications. Would like to see bids.

Prebys: Said cost has never been a concern of the commission.

Rupert: Affirmed that the commission must understand what is going to happen to each opening.

Pettit: Asked to go back to the original drawing and go over the front step by step.

Doran: Referenced the engineering drawing. Stated that the front façade will be tuck-pointed and cracks repaired. There are small areas along the top that need to be rebuilt. Referenced where the old cornice was- needs some work. Area where the hoods were torn of needs work because they are uneven. In future, would love to do something similar to Thompson Block [400 N River] with details that are period appropriate but for now will just be tuck-pointing and repairing the masonry and a solid coat of paint.

Prebys: Asked to confirm that the areas where the hoods were removed would stay rough.

Doran: Confirmed. Stated they hoped to replace window decorative elements in two years when the building is earning money.

Doran: [Referenced the drawing] Stated that the historic window on the 102 W Michigan shop front will be repaired, and a new shop front added. The 100 W Michigan shop front with the steel beam needs to be completely rebuilt. A lot of structural work will go in to support that corner.

Prebys: Asked to confirm that both the shop fronts would be at the front level and not recessed.

Doran: Confirmed, they would remain as they are.

Doran: Referenced replacement windows. Could do wood-framed windows divided into four lights.

Swift: Stated that the windows on the south elevation and those that wrap the building corner on the east elevation are the most important.

[Discussion of infilled and retained window openings]

Swift: Indicated that she would be open to allowed infill if the windows being replaced or kept are more in line with the original.

Doran: Stated that the window would have to be wood-framed and a rectangular window.

Swift: indicated that if that is the option, would like to discuss how center jamb is given the weight it needs. Could be a thicker muntin to replicate rhythm, or be two double hung windows placed together.

Rupert: Clarified the central jamb as a mullion.

Swift: Stated that the central jamb is key to the visual weight and exterior lines of the building.

Prebys: Indicated the commission would be supportive of having that appearance applied over the windows.

Staff: Clarified that a single light could have a mullion and muntin applied over.

Swift: Stated that there should be a sketch with dimensions.

Rupert: Stated that there is one on Pearl Street, next to Ace Hardware, there is one similar.

[Discussion of muntin and mullion composition]

Pettit: Asked if HDC would be willing to work with a single pane fixed piece of glass with the appropriate dividing elements applied over it.

Swift: Indicated this may be appropriate if it were a central jamb solution with two fixed pieces and some muntins. Would also be open to operable sashes with a thick muntin.

Pettit: Affirmed that it is possible the HDC would be willing to work with a fixed window but with a grille pattern.

Doran: Stated he had pushed for a design that would divide the window into four.

Swift: Asked for clarification that this would be one piece of glass.

Doran: Confirmed. One piece of glass with faux dividers.

Swift: Stated that if there is going to be fixed windows, the jamb should replicate the center jamb posts with two pieces of fixed glass. Asked applicant to investigate and see if it is feasible. Could be squared or arched.

Rupert: Stated the windows do not have to be wood or metal.

[Discussion of window cladding]

Doran: Stated he would prefer wood windows, however replication is where it gets expensive. The one he suggested looking into is a single pane with four divided panels.

Pettit: Indicated that simple of a pattern is something the HDC would struggle with.

Doran: Asked if that applied even to the front of the building.

HDC members confirmed.

Doran: Asked the HDC to consider that the façade windows are currently vinyl and not historic.

Pettit: Asked if the arches are different between the 100 and 102 W Michigan facades.

Doran: [Referred to drawings and described that some appear to have wood and others masonry].

Pettit: Stated that the (façade) windows appear as though they were treated differently. Asked the HDC if they would ask the applicant to reopen the arches.

Swift: Stated that the HDC had been discussing square windows, and the details of the frames.

Pettit [Reviewed window details]. Stated that the HDC has not asked folks to replace windows based on a guess of what might have been there. Cannot think of a precedent.

Prebys: Asked Doran for clarification on replacements.

Doran: Reaffirmed that the original proposal was to replace windows with a solid fixed aluminum-framed window. In order to compromise at the meeting, said he would do solid wood-framed windows. Stated that the only viable option is a wood window with four dividers.

Swift: Asked to revisit Pettit's comment regarding window replacements.

[Discussion of precedent, and appropriate period to go back to].

Swift: Stated this is an opportunity to get to the original architectural intent as much as possible.

Pettit: Stated that is not consistent with other buildings downtown.

Slagor: Clarified period of significance. The local historic district ordinance is so old that it does not identify contributing and non-contributing buildings. When possible, staff defers to the National Register nomination, which is also 40 years old. The nomination has the building as non-contributing because of the paneling, but also has a caveat that buildings could be made contributing if restored. In his opinion, this makes interpretation tricky. He also clarified that the period of significance for the National Register district is 1832-1932.

[Discussion of contributing vs. non-contributing].

Swift: This is an opportunity to weigh in on decisions made to a building that was non-contributing because of alterations that were removed. This is different than a non-contributing building that was identified because of a newer construction date.

Doran: Stated that different kinds of windows have been approved up and down Michigan Avenue. Exceptions appear to have been made. Not asking for something that will stand out and look out-of place, and want to preserve some of the details. Recognizes that the HDC sees this as an opportunity to fix problems with the building. The existing vinyl windows were installed in 2012.

Prebys: Stated that the windows were installed without approval.

Doran: Stated that is likely the vinyl windows will be left in.

Swift: Stated that the proposed new windows would not be appropriate. [Sketched window-using historical photos as a guide]

Prebys: Asked to consider side elevation windows to be a full panel of glass.

[Discussion of infill windows vs. open]

Prebys: Asked about front façade and first four on the east elevation having a historic appearance with greater flexibility on the other windows.

Swift: Affirmed that may be an approach.

Rupert: Suggested Marvin windows. [Discussion]

Doran: Stated that they hoped to use Pella windows, but it was too costly.

Prebys: Asked applicant what he needed to have accomplished at the meeting to continue.

Doran: Indicated that any one of the issues could be addressed, including masonry/brickwork, tuck-pointing, and rebuilding.

Swift: Asked if the brick Doran brought in will be used.

Doran: Confirmed, used on the rear elevation.

Rupert: Stated they cannot approve applications in sections.

Slagor: The applicant must voluntarily modify the application at the meeting to include one thing and strike another.

Pettit: Confirmed.

Swift: Stated that the HDC cannot approve windows this evening.

Pettit: Stated that more details are needed. But masonry can probably be address.

Doran: Asked about approval of infill.

[Review infill plans]

Rupert: Indicated he has no problem with the infill as proposed.

Swift: Indicated that she would find it appropriate if they can be sure the window solution would be more appropriate and matching some of the original details.

Rupert: Asked if the HDC could request the applicant to store and preserve original window.

Swift: Stated that should be a caveat for approval of removal of original materials. Stated that this is more part of the window approval. If they are going to approve masonry infill, that they will need compromise that the remaining windows are more appropriate. To be discussed on the next meeting.

Pettit: Stated that is a nonspecific condition and would not be appropriate. The HDC needs a more specific answer if it is going to interfere with masonry.

Swift: Indicated the HDC could outline important architectural elements of the windows that they would like to see introduced into the design of the new windows. The central jamb is an important factor. The window can be square with appropriate trim to reflect the original arched

opening. Reiterated that the central jamb needs to be replicated. Can be operable or fixed. Central muntin for two sashes should be thicker. Muntins can be an exterior application.

Prebys: Does that have to be on the motion? Based on discussion, it should just be for repairing and replacing brick.

Slagor: Said that the applicant would need to amend the application for just masonry approval. The windows could be discussed as a study item. Conditions for window approval would be a good idea for future window applications.

Swift: Asked if there would be an opportunity to review windows if there is something in the motion.

Doran: Said they would not commit to a specific design.

Slagor: Stated, you would put requests in tabling.

Doran: Asked to amend the application to include only masonry work.

Rupert: Asked to clarify masonry work- brick infill of some openings, and reconstruction of part of the exterior. Items [4]C and [4]D of the staff review.

[Discussion of finer points of the motion]

Swift: Asked if painting was part of this application.

Rupert: Stated it was amended to only include masonry.

Prebys stated a color sample for the future painting would be helpful.

Pettit: Asked for clarification on metal coping of the roof.

Doran: Stated that coping would not be done until after masonry. Goal is to do anything now with masonry as it has been a struggle to get folks committed to the work and there is someone lined up for tomorrow.

[Discussion working through appropriate motion]

Motion: Swift (second: Rupert) Move to approve and issue a certificate of appropriateness for work proposed at 100 W Michigan as amended at the Dec. 10, 2019 Historic District Commission meeting. Approval is conditioned on the items discussed at the meeting. Specifically application details 4C and 4D, [from the staff review] brick infill of some openings and reconstruction of part of the exterior. Some of the window openings on the east elevation are to be removed, including third and fourth bays north from the southwest corner, which are in sections that need to be reconstructed, totaling four windows. This infill shall be setback a minimum of one inch from face of façade to indicate original openings. As well as the northern five bays on the same elevation, totaling 10 windows. They will have the same infill treatment as the other infill windows, with a setback of at least one inch to match windows in bays three and four; all matching the approved north elevation details infill details. The Commission would recommend that efforts be taken to preserve and store any existing original windows that are in sound enough condition to store and preserve.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:
#5 – Preserve distinctive features.

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried

Pettit: Stated to the applicant that they are not trying to create additional challenges, but are trying to execute their mission while promoting development in the city.

Slagor: Stated he will compile a summary of what HDC is looking for, will send it to the HDC for review and then on to the applicant. Wants to ensure a complete application.

STUDY ITEMS

302 E Cross

**Windows and siding update.*

Applicant: Maxwell Ziebarth, owner- present.

Discussion: Pettit: Asked to update siding.

Ziebarth: Provided a sample of original and replacement siding. Indicated that the new siding had gone up on the west elevation, facing to Park Street, where the porch was removed. Stated he is also working on closing in foundation basement well.

Pettit: Indicated there was concern for open holes on the façade.

Ziebarth: Stated that was addressed yesterday, with OSB protecting openings.

Pettit: Asked about the foundation.

[Discussed details of interior foundation work]. Ziebarth stated most work is taking place inside with no change to the exterior.

Pettit: Asked about siding.

Ziebarth: Indicated he will continue working on the west elevation porch to get the porch back up.

Pettit: Asked the completion date for the siding.

Ziebarth: Stated he will work through December.

Pettit: Asked if an update can be provided in January.

Ziebarth: Confirmed.

Rupert: Asked about the porch roof rafters on the west elevation.

Ziebarth: Stated the porch roof was never appropriately attached because it was added later.

[Discussion of incorporating porch roof into the structure].

Swift: Stated there was concern to have the wall sided before winter weather.

Ziebarth: Stated he can work on the porch ceiling joists outward.

[Discussion of porch dimension and closing off the open areas]

Pettit: Confirmed that work can continue, just have it buttoned-up as soon as possible.

Pettit: Asked about the windows.

Ziebarth: Stated he is looking into Jeld-Wen Sash packs, aluminum-clad wood with muntins.

Prebys: Stated that the windows are historically one-over-one with no muntins and should not be added.

Ziebarth: Stated he did not need muntins. However there is more detail on the bay windows on the east elevation, and front window. Would like to preserve those.

Rupert: Suggested storm widows on the bays.

Swift: Asked if it was established that replacement windows are appropriate.

Rupert: Stated that they had established issues with sashes and not the jambs.

Slagor: Stated that the HDC asked for a proposal for windows but has not explicitly asked for a window-by-window assessment.

[Discussion of window features, which should be replaced and which should be preserved]

Prebys: Stated the HDC needs an itemized list of windows, showing condition and specific window it would be replaced with.

Pettit: Stated that a lot of windows look repairable and will want to see details as to why it is or is not possible.

[Discussion of windows in photos].

Swift: Indicated it would be easy to make a case for replacement of missing windows or non-historic replacements, or rot.

Ziebarth: Stated he understands that he is trying to keep continuity of preservation and is factoring in windows that are there in replacements. Stated that the bay on east elevation is in great shape and just needs some work. Same for north elevation bay.

Swift: Reaffirmed that features of architectural importance and street-facing facades are of chief concern for the HDC.

Discussion [Date of the next meeting discussed, and study items to be addressed]

Pettit: Asked about doors.

Ziebarth: Stated door on east elevation has deteriorated and was added in the 60s. Would like the two front doors repaired as they are solid.

Pettit: Stated that after door and window discussion there will be discussion of porch.

Ziebarth: [Brief discussion of skirting].

[Discussion of appropriate motion]

Swift: Asked about foundation work.

Slagor: Stated that foundation work has been approved and the applicant is just providing updates. The exterior holes are filled in, but work is ongoing on the interior.

[Discussion of next meeting]

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) Move to have progress update and study item at the January 14, 2020 Historic District Commission meeting for the property at 302 E Cross. The owner is to provide the HDC with a plan for windows, including which need to be replaced, and how; and documentation of the final closing of exterior of the building; and an update on foundation work at the meeting on January 14, 2020.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------|
| 1. 305 E Forest | Roof |
| 2. 301 N Adams | Garage roof |
| 3. 201 W Michigan | Roof |
| 4. 314 Pearl | Garage roof |

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moved to approve the administrative approvals for 305 E Forest, 301 N Adams, 201 W Michigan, 314 Pearl.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Small Cell Colocation at 301 N Hamilton

Slagor: Reviewed what Section 106 is and the proposed project. Affirmed that a permit would be required, but asked HDC to have an opportunity to comment.

Rupert: Stated that there is precedent for HDC permits for small cell towers at 124 Pearl.

Pettit: Biggest question is what the tower will look like.

[Discussion of tower colocation and necessary visual]

Pettit: Asked about junction box.

Swift: Asked about landscaping.

[Discussion of small cell tower continued]

Slagor: Summarized that the HDC is concerned about how the tower will affect the integrity of setting of the district as it relates to the surrounding contributing buildings.

HDC: Affirmed Slagor's statement.

2. Property monitoring

General discussion of doors and unapproved work in the district; and potential for door fact sheets.

3. Commissioner comments

General discussion of doors and unapproved work in the district.

Swift: Asked about Window Fact Sheet.

Slagor: Has a draft completed.

Swift: Asked for that to be up at the next meeting.

Swift: Officially wished everyone a happy holiday season.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS- none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

1. HDC 2020 Schedule

Motion: Rupert (second: Swift) moved to approve the 2020 Historic District Commission schedule as presented.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

2. Approval of the minutes of November 12, 2019

Motion: Rupert (second: Prebys) moved to approve the minutes of November 12, 2019, as drafted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

MEETING ADJOURNED at 9:36 p.m.

Full Minutes Prepared By: Scott Slagor