



AGENDA

Historic District Commission Meeting

7:00 PM - Tuesday, October 11, 2022
Council Chambers

	Page
1. CALL TO ORDER	
2. ROLL CALL	
Alex Pettit, Chair James Chesnut, Vice Chair Delrhea Byrge James Ratzlaff Stefan Szumko Ellen Thackery, Staff	
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	
4. PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS	
5. PUBLIC HEARINGS	
6. BUSINESS SESSION	
6.1. OLD BUSINESS	
6.2. NEW BUSINESS	3 - 19
47 N Huron mural agenda item 218 N River agenda item	
6.3. STUDY ITEMS	21 - 27
Study Item for 311 N River	
6.4. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS	
6.5. OTHER BUSINESS	29 - 50
1. Property Monitoring 2. Updates from Staff 3. Commissioner Comments Study Item Deferred Maintenance at 90 Maple	
7. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS	
8. HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS	
8.1. Approval of meeting minutes 9/27/2022	51 - 57
Historic District 9-27-2022 draft	
9. ADJOURNMENT	



HDC Work Permit Staff Review

Property address: 47 N Huron

Property History: This building contributes to the National Register district and is described in the nomination as a "2-story, narrow-fronted and deep, pent-roof (with shingled front gable), Queen Anne commercial building." It has the original brick portion along the sidewalk, and a large, full-height addition to the rear of concrete block. It is the concrete block portion where this mural is proposed, along the parking lot side. All of the masonry has already been painted at some point in the past.

Date of Application: 9/30/22

Date of Review: 10/5/22

Date of Meeting: 10/11/22

Proposed work: Priming wall, painting new mural (cleaning not necessary)

Materials: vapor-permeable exterior paint suitable for masonry surfaces and protective vapor-permeable sealants. Technical specifications of paint and sealant still to come.

Staff review:

1. Applicant proposes priming wall with Sherwin Williams vapor-permeable primer, painting mural with Sherwin Williams vapor-permeable paint, and then sealing with _____ vapor-permeable sealer.
2. Because the masonry building has already been painted, painting is acceptable by the City's guidelines.
3. This is simply paint, which staff can technically approve, but staff wasn't entirely sure about administrative approval of murals.
4. The surface preparation and treatment is the HDC's concern. The content/color/style of the art is not in the HDC's purview.

1. Use property for original purpose or provide compatible use with minimal alteration.

2. Do not destroy original character. Do not remove or alter historic material or features.

3. Do not imitate earlier styles.

4. Preserve significant changes acquired over time.

5. Preserve distinctive features.

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

7. Clean building gently—no sandblasting.

8. Preserve archaeological resources.

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

10. New work shall be removable.

5. Because this is not advertising a particular business or product, this is not considered a sign requiring Zoning review.
6. Because this art will be painted directly on the building and not mounted, no building permit is needed.
7. Because the work will be happening along the side of the building bordering on and possibly in a city parking lot, coordination will be needed with the Department of Public Services. Appropriate public safety precautions will be needed.

Relevant Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

#9

Recommended Motion:

Move to issue a certificate of appropriateness for Application PHDC-22-0085 for a new mural to be painted on the south side of the building at 47 N Huron toward the west end with all vapor-permeable products. Because the work is not on a historic portion of the building, and because breathable products will be used, the work meets Secretary of the Interior's Standard for Rehabilitation #9.

Prepared by:

Ellen Thackery, Preservation Planner



City of Ypsilanti
Historic District Commission
Work Permit Application
One South Huron • Ypsilanti, MI 48197
Phone: (734) 483-9646
Fax: (734) 483-7260
www.cityofypsilanti.com

Office Use Only:	
Receipt:	_____
Method:	_____
Action/Study Item	
PHDC-	_____

To complete this application:

1. Complete this form.
2. Attach the following documents:
 - a. Photo(s) showing an overview of the building and all locations where work is proposed (can be emailed).
 - b. Catalog cut sheets or similar details for windows, doors, light fixtures, and any other manufactured or preassembled components—this includes information from catalogues, professional quotes, or websites (can be emailed).
 - c. Dimensioned drawings of any new construction or modifications to existing structures, including awnings and signs.
 - d. A sketch plan, if proposal is for work on the grounds and not just the main structure (e.g., installing a new driveway, fence, or shed). This can be drawn on a scaled copy of a mortgage survey.
3. Applications and materials must be received by the Building Department **no later** than 4pm on the Friday eleven (11) days prior to the meeting.

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL BE REJECTED

Property

Address

47 North Huron Street, Ypsilanti, MI 48197

Applicant

**If applicant is not owner of property, a written statement from the owner authorizing this application must be included.*

Name

The Corner Health Center; Alex Plum, Executive Director

Address

47 North Huron Street

City

Ypsilanti

State

MI

Zip

48197

Phone / Fax

E-Mail **Staff will contact you primarily via email*

Contractor

Contractor Name & Contact Info

Curtis Wallace;

Type of work

- ☐ Roofing
☐ Window/Door
Replacement

- ☐ Porches
☐ Sign
☐ Fence (or other sitework)

- ☒ Painting
☐ Application Amendment
☐ Other

Complete Description of Proposed Work:

Mural to be painted on the brick masonry block on the south building facade.

Materials (for paint include color chips or samples with application):

Vapor-permeable exterior paint suitable for masonry surfaces, and protective sealants.

Permit Application Fee (action items only)

The fee is \$45 for the first \$3,000 in construction cost plus \$5 for every additional \$1 - \$3,000 of construction cost. There is a flat fee of \$10 for painting only. *An additional fee of \$50 applies to HDC work started without the applicable permit.*

Construction Cost:

\$17,000

Permit fee:

~~\$45~~ + ~~\$85~~ = ~~\$130.00~~

\$10 painting only et

Signature

I hereby attest that the above information is accurate. I am authorized to and grant permission to the City of Ypsilanti staff to be on the subject property for the purposes of preparing staff reports and/or evaluating this application.

I further affirm that this property has, or will have before the proposed work is completed, a fire alarm system or smoke alarm complying with the Stille-DeRossett-Hale single-state construction code, PA 230 of 1972, as amended.

Signature:

[Redacted Signature]

Date:

29 September 2022

Print Name:

Alexander Plun

If you have questions about what the HDC generally permits or does not permit, or what they need to see in an application to render a decision, please call the office at 734-483-9646, email us at ethackery@cityofypsilanti.com, or view our factsheets at cityofypsilanti.com/hd.

All other necessary Building Permits must be acquired before beginning work.









HDC Work Permit Staff Review

Property address: 218 N River

Property History: 218 N River is a contributing resource to the National Register district. The nomination describes the house as a "1 and 1½ -story, gable-roof Queen Anne." The house used to be covered in white asbestos siding (see survey picture below from 1981). This siding was on the house until at least 2006 (see pictures below from 2006). Between 2006 and 2011, the asbestos siding was removed.

By 2011, on Google streetview, the house looks much as it does currently (see current staff pictures below). Staff finds a letter on file dated October 3, 2017 that explains that work had been approved and was to have started within 6 months of the issuance of the certificate of appropriateness. The work approved in September 2016 included work on the front gable's siding, window restoration, siding repair and replacement on house's north side, removal and replication of eyebrows and corbels, and the building of a temporary frame to hold scaffolding. It is unclear to staff how much progress has been made on this approved work to date (staff can discuss with owners), but a new roof was administratively approved this month.

Date of Application: 9/30/22

Date of Review: 10/7/22

Date of Meeting: 10/11/22

Proposed work: Chimney partial rebuild, install new flue, new limestone cap, cement wash on limestone, grind and repoint to roofline. Roof jacks to be installed to perform work. Note: application mentions seal coating entire chimney, but property owner has decided not to seal coat.

Materials: red common bricks, mortar

Staff review:

1. Use property for original purpose or provide compatible use with minimal alteration.

2. Do not destroy original character. Do not remove or alter historic material or features.

3. Do not imitate earlier styles.

4. Preserve significant changes acquired over time.

5. Preserve distinctive features.

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

7. Clean building gently—no sandblasting.

8. Preserve archaeological resources.

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

10. New work shall be removable.

1. Rebuilding and repointing a chimney are good steps in the preservation of a building, as long as appropriately soft mortar is used.
2. See below for mortar formula for use with soft brick.
3. Before proceeding with work, applicant must obtain the appropriate building department permits.

Repairing and Repointing Historic Brick

The soft, low-fired brick commonly used in pre-1900 buildings is like a loaf of bread – soft inside, crusty outside. It was laid up with soft mortar. Modern cement-based mortar is very hard and creates a serious problem if used with old soft brick. During the freeze-thaw cycle, hard mortar does not yield to expansion and contraction, causing the outer crust of the brick to spall, or break off. Once this crust is gone, moisture penetrates the brick; when it freezes, the brick is further damaged, ultimately turning it to dust. Thus, soft mortar with high lime content must be used whenever old soft brick is laid or repointed. Any mortar must be tinted to match existing mortar color.

Mortar Formula for Use with Soft Brick

- 10 parts sharp mason's sand
- 4 parts hydrated lime
- 1 part white Portland cement, Type I, ASTM C150
- 1/4 to 1/8 box of tint to match existing mortar color, as directed by manufacturer (run pancake tests to confirm dried color match)

For more information, please see NPS Technical *Preservation Brief 2: Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings*, available at <https://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/briefs/2-repoint-mortar-joints.htm> .

Relevant Secretary of the Interior's Standards:
#2, #6

Recommended Motion:

Move to issue a certificate of appropriateness for Application PHDC-22-0089 for the partial rebuilding of the chimney at 218 N River and the repointing of entire chimney, with the conditions that a soft mortar appropriate for historic bricks is used in the work and that a seal coat is not applied to the chimney.

Prepared by:
Ellen Thackery, Preservation Planner

☒ Contributing ☐ Non-contributing ☐ LANDMARK

YPSILANTI MICHIGAN HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE SURVEY

Sheet# _____

SURVEY NAME YPSILANTI ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY

SURVEY DATE Fall 1982 SURVEYED BY Resource Design Group

ADDRESS 218 N. River

HISTORIC NAME _____

CURRENT NAME _____

TYPE OF USAGE: ☒ Residential, ☐ Multi-residential, ☐ Commercial,
☐ Mixed commercial & residential.

Zoning _____

NUMBER OF FLOORS 1 1/2 FRONT DIRECTION W

SURFACE MATERIAL: asbestos ROOF MATERIAL: asphalt

GRADED ITEMS - PLACE A CHECK OR "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE SPACE

STRUCTURAL CONDITION: Excellent () Good () Fair ☒ Poor ()
MAINTENANCE QUALITY: Excellent () Good () Fair ☒ Poor ()

ALTERATIONS: None () Minor () Moderate ☒ Extensive ()
ARE ALTERATIONS: Appropriate () Inappropriate ☒

Attach photo here



Design R.A. Schweitzer, 1981

Style or Period

Vernacular

Date of Construction _____

ARCHITECTURAL MERIT

National Importance
Local Excellence
Notable
Worthy of Mention
Poor
Other

INCIDENCE

Rare
Moderate
Common

Date of Photograph Fall 1982

Photo by Resource Design Group

Roll# 32 Frame# 27

41



218 N. River

7 Nov 06

Rm



218 N. River

7 Nov 06

BH



218 N River, west façade, October 7, 2022. Chimney can be seen covered here with black plastic. (staff photo)



218 N River, chimney detail, October 7, 2022. (staff photo)



OCT 04 2022

RECEIVED

City of Ypsilanti Historic District Commission Work Permit Application

One South Huron • Ypsilanti, MI 48197

Phone: (734) 483-9646

Fax: (734) 483-7260

www.cityofypsilanti.com

Office Use Only:

Receipt: 30509

Method: 5098

Action/Study Item

PHDC- 22-0089

To complete this application:

1. Complete this form.
2. Attach the following documents:
 - a. Photo(s) showing an overview of the building and all locations where work is proposed (can be emailed).
 - b. Catalog cut sheets or similar details for windows, doors, light fixtures, and any other manufactured or preassembled components—this includes information from catalogues, professional quotes, or websites (can be emailed).
 - c. Dimensioned drawings of any new construction or modifications to existing structures, including awnings and signs.
 - d. A sketch plan, if proposal is for work on the grounds and not just the main structure (e.g., installing a new driveway, fence, or shed). This can be drawn on a scaled copy of a mortgage survey.
3. Applications and materials must be received by the Building Department **no later** than 4pm on the Friday eleven (11) days prior to the meeting.

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL BE REJECTED

Property

Address

218 N. RIVER ST.

Applicant

**If applicant is not owner of property, a written statement from the owner authorizing this application must be included.*

Name

MICHAEL FURBACHER / DONALD FURBACHER

Address

728 NORRIS ST.

City

YPSILANTI

State

MICH

Zip

48198

Phone / Fax

E-Mail *Staff will contact you primarily via email

Contractor

Contractor Name & Contact Info

LIC. & INSURED

CELL (313) 758-7981 OFFICE (734) 345-9076

WAYNE OSWALD - SILVERBACK CONSTRUCTION, LLC / WOSWALD@SILVERBACKCONST.COM

Type of work

- ☐ Roofing
☐ Window/Door Replacement

- ☐ Porches
☐ Sign
☐ Fence (or other sitework)

- ☐ Painting
☐ Application Amendment
☒ Other CHIMNEY

Complete Description of Proposed Work:

SILVERBACK CONSTRUCTION CO. LLC

1. REMOVE TOP 12"-14" OF CHIMNEY STRUCTURE
2. PREP AND REBUILD TOP OF CHIMNEY (RED COMMON)
3. INSTALL NEW 12"x12" FLH WITH SS REBAR SUPPORT
4. INSTALL LIME STONE CAP
5. INSTALL CEMENT WASH ON TOP OF LIME STONE
6. GRIND AND TUCK POINT REMAINDER OF CHIMNEY DOWN TO ROOF LINE.
7. SEAL COAT ENTIRE CHIMNEY

NOTE: ROOF JACKS TO BE INSTALLED TO PERFORM WORK
CLEAN AND REMOVE ALL DEBRIS

Materials (for paint include color chips or samples with application):

Permit Application Fee (action items only)

The fee is \$45 for the first \$3,000 in construction cost plus \$5 for every additional \$1 - \$3,000 of construction cost. There is a flat fee of \$10 for painting only. An additional fee of \$50 applies to HDC work started without the applicable permit.

Construction Cost: \$ 3200.00

Permit fee:

\$45 +

=

Signature

I hereby attest that the above information is accurate. I am authorized to and grant permission to the City of Ypsilanti staff to be on the subject property for the purposes of preparing staff reports and/or evaluating this application.

I further affirm that this property has, or will have before the proposed work is completed, a fire alarm system or smoke alarm complying with the Stille-DeRossett-Hale single-state construction code, PA 230 of 1972, as amended.

Signature:

Date:

SEPT. 30, 2022

Print Name:

MICHAEL FURBACHER

If you have questions about what the HDC generally permits or does not permit, or what they need to see in an application to render a decision, please call the office at 734-483-9646, email us at ethackery@cityofypsilanti.com, or view our factsheets at cityofypsilanti.com/hd.

All other necessary Building Permits must be acquired before beginning work.



Historic District Commission

Study Item and Materials

311 E Forest Ave

Study Item for 311 N River, October 11, 2022

I am interested in installing a sliding door on the rear of my home at 311 E Forest Ave, in the place where a window in the dining room now exists. This area is not visible from the street. I'm currently unsure what the specific model would be, but I am looking at standard 60"x80" or 72"x80" two-panel vinyl or fiberglass doors, likely white or almond in color and without any grilles in the glass, which would be clear. Potential example: <https://www.pella.com/shop/doors/patio-doors/encompass/sliding-patio-doors/>



I've attached several photos of the outside of my house, as well as the proposed installation area highlighted by a red square. The long term goal is to add a paver patio or deck to this area, with stairs leading down from the sliding door.

Thank you,

Nikki Nabozny



Front of house



Side of house



Rear of house showing proposed location of new slider



Rear of house



Rear of house

Looking at Deferred Maintenance at 90 Maple, Train Depot

At the historic district commission's request, staff visited the train depot site October 6, 2022 to document deferred maintenance and site issues.

Staff has grouped the observed issues into three categories: roof, masonry, and structural.

I. Roof issues:

Worn shingles, missing shingles, a hole in the roof, deteriorating fascia boards





























II. Masonry issues:

Paint/sealant is failing and soft bricks are now exposed in several places















III. Structural issues:

A drainage issue appears to be affecting structural integrity in the roof, fascia, and decorative brackets of the porte cochere and another part of the roof near the parking lot where there are big, overgrown shrubs





MINUTES

City of Ypsilanti
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
Meeting held in person at Ypsilanti Freighthouse

Tuesday, September 27, 2022
7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair called meeting to order at 7:03 pm.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present:

Alex Pettit – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti
James Chesnut – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti
Stefan Szumko – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti
James Ratzlaff – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti
Delrhea Byrge—Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Ellen Thackery, Preservation Planner

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Ratzlaff (second: Chesnut) moved to approve the agenda.

Approval: Voice vote. Unanimous. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS--none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS

408 N Huron--clarification

**Rebuilding a foundation wall and installing a window*

Applicant: Thomas McKee, applicant, present.

Staff Report: Staff clarified that this item is not meant to be a new discussion or a new decision. Applicant wanted to clarify what his approval was for. He had thought the approval from August would

have allowed him to install either a sliding window or glass block, but the minutes seemed to reflect just glass block, so applicant just wanted to clarify.

Discussion: Commissioners who were present at the meeting explained that they sought to deny the vinyl slider because it was vinyl, and so instead, approved the glass block. Another commissioner suggested that if glass block were installed so it was recessed from the face of the building, it would not be as noticeable. Applicant agreed that he would follow that recommendation.

No motion, no vote, clarification achieved.

513 N River

**New shed and patio.*

Applicant: Commissioner Szumko recused himself from the discussion and vote. Property owner was also present.

Staff Report: Staff had noted that this agenda item has been postponed a couple times due to quorum, the decision must be made tonight, and that treated lumber would be stained or painted and staff had no other concerns.

Discussion: Commissioners did not have any comments, perhaps because this item has been in the packet several times and there has been ample time to review the proposal.

Motion: Ratzlaff (second: Byrge) moved to issue a certificate of appropriateness for application PHDC 22 0071 dated August 2, 2022 for a new shed and covered patio behind the garage because the proposed work meets Secretary of the Interior's Standard 9, as long as any treated lumber will be painted or opaquely stained once it cures and as long as the proposed work successfully passes zoning and building department review.

Approval: Roll call vote. Unanimous. Motion carried.

216 S Washington

**4" vent cap installed on side of house for bathroom exterior venting*

Applicant: Not present.

Staff Report: Staff had noted that they didn't have concerns with the application.

Discussion: Commissioners noted that this would be a very small impact and that it would not be possible to vent through the roof because this is a second-floor bathroom and there is a third floor on the house.

Motion: Ratzlaff (second: Chesnut) moved to issue a certificate of appropriateness for application PHDC-22-0078 for the installation of a 4-inch white vent cap for a bathroom fan to be painted to match

the stucco proposed at 216 S Washington because the proposed work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, specifically Standard 9.

Approval: Roll call vote. Unanimous. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

111 N Huron

** Updated sign*

Applicant: Applicant present.

Staff Report: This application is for a sign that is very similar to the sign already installed. It is a monument sign that is lighted, as the existing sign is, and you can see by the nighttime simulation picture (page 48 of the packet) that the top part of the sign that appears white during the day is not actually all a lighted white wash of light at night. Instead, it appears dark and only the letters appear in that upper part of the sign at night. Because it's very close to the sign that already exists, staff did not have concerns.

Discussion: Commissioners discussed that historically, the commission has wanted to avoid that bright wash of light, so if a sign will be internally illuminated, the background should be dark to avoid that bright wash behind the letters or logo. Applicant explained that in this case, the white at the top of the sign is painted aluminum and the clear letters are pushed through, so the light only lights the letters.

Motion: Ratzlaff (second: Byrge) moved to issue a certificate of appropriateness for Application PHDC 22-0083 dated September 20, 2022 for a replacement monument sign measuring 7'6" by 7' at 111 N Huron because the sign: is similar to the existing, does not destroy historic materials or spatial relationships, is compatible in scale and proportion to the nearby historic resources, and is removable without impact to historic resources, meeting Standards 9 and 10. Further, the background of the proposed sign is dark and only the words are illuminated, which aligns with the exception listed in the City's fact sheet for signs. This sign will still need to be reviewed by the Planning and Building Departments, and will need to meet their requirements. Any amendments to the sign's design will need to be reviewed by the historic district commission.

Approval: Roll call vote. Unanimous. Motion carried.

319 N Huron

**New internally lit signs over garage and office area*

Applicant: Laith Issa, applicant, present.

Staff Report: This application is for two internally lit signs, and the building has not had lighted signs in the past. The building is considered non-contributing to the district. Staff suggests that perhaps we should clarify some items on our sign guidelines as a future project.

Discussion: Commission discussed that, again, it's that wash of light from a backlit sign that the commission has tried to avoid in the past. Here, over the garage, there are individual letters that will be backlit internally with no connecting backlit background. That's one type of sign. There is also another type of sign that you have over the office that includes an illuminated background behind the words. It is that lit, light-in-color background that creates that wash of light behind the words that the commission has traditionally tried to avoid. Commissioner would want to have the white on this sign behind the letters masked. Other commissioners said maybe a solution would be separate letters for over the office, like over the garage. Proportionally, the signs look like they'd meet the Standards. Applicant agreed to ask his signmaker what would be possible, and asked if it would be possible for the commission to give a conditional approval so that he wouldn't have to come back before the commission with an amended application. Commission agreed that they could achieve that outcome in a motion.

Motion: Chesnut (second: Szumko) moved to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the two new internally-lit signs proposed at 319 N Huron (application PHDC 22-0080 dated September 12, 2022) because the building is noncontributing, only the letters on the signs will emit light, and the proposed signs will not have a significant negative impact on the district. Additionally, the commission requests that the applicant submits to staff additional information showing that the white part of the sign over the office area will not be illuminated and information that clearly shows that the white part of the sign will be masked so just the letters are lit. As a result, the proposed work meets Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 9 and 10.

Approval: Roll call vote. Unanimous. Motion carried.

STUDY ITEMS

311 Washtenaw

Contractor: Contractor Ron Rupert present.

Discussion: Currently, here at 311 Washtenaw, there is asphalt or Insulbrick siding on this rear enclosed porch that is failing, as shown on page 67 of the packet. The next-door property at 313 Washtenaw is a twin to this one and Ron's client likes what that next-door neighbor has done to side their rear enclosed porch—they installed vertical OSB siding to cover that enclosed porch where the old siding was failing. Ron had asked staff if that work had been approved. It had not. So, Ron wanted to come talk with the commission about what would be an acceptable siding to recover the enclosed porch at 311. Ron notes that the rear enclosed porch does not have a moisture barrier or clapboards underneath—just planks. Commission discussed that, normally, you'd install the same material as is on the house, but, as Ron states, Insulbrick is not made anymore. So what is acceptable now?

Commission notes that the example with vertical siding has no cornerboards or window trim, which would be needed in the historic district. Ron agrees—cornerboards, window trim, and a rain table at the bottom are all needed. Ron thinks that wood board-and-batten siding would be

more appropriate for the building than the vertical OSB. A commissioner requested a sample of the material to understand the proposal better. Ron also notes that the house itself has clapboard siding under the insulbrick siding, so if the insulbrick were to be removed in the future on the house itself, the board-and-batten on the rear portion would be compatible but also differentiated. Discussed possible use of Azek instead of wood since this is the rear of the house, a non-historic enclosure, and very damp. Commission seemed open to that idea, and one commissioner suggested that as long as all of the trim and boards were all of a material consistently, that would be preferable so that all of the materials would move together. Discussed idea of adding gutters to this space and addressing how the flashing appears visibly where the rear enclosed porch meets the house.

115 Maple

Homeowners: Both present.

Discussion: Updating commission. Has been looking at structural integrity of foundation, costs, and ways to offset that. What we have today is a report from a structural engineer and more photos. Structural engineer's report states that house needs a more substantial foundation. Now that we have seen these pictures of the property, we can all see repairs are needed. The wall in question is brick on cobble on clay, trying not to disturb, had Omega Construction in and they described that this would be a hand-dig project. Excavation would cost about \$30,000. Thinking about restoration vs removal of back half of the building (non-historic part) and rebuilding. Would a cinderblock foundation be allowed? New roof now on. Clarifying that we are talking about the back half of the property—where the additions are—and leaving the historic portion at front of the property on the brick foundation in place. Confirmed. A couple different ways to give this house more foundation. There is the hand dig of course, but then one idea that has been mentioned by the structural engineer is to build interior foundation walls of wood. Confirmed again that we are talking about the rear 400 feet of the house. The historic part of the house is in good condition and is level and he wants to save that.

As for the study questions, a commissioner states that having cinderblock on part of the foundation would likely not be a problem but perhaps there are some different ways to treat it-- block could be parged for example to soften it. Other thing is the idea of demolishing the later additions and then building a new addition behind the historic house. That is definitely on the table as a possibility but it all depends on what you propose to build. You don't need to have finished, expensive drawings, but some informative drawings and representations of the volume you'd be proposing, and what you propose to do with the original structure are both really important to the conversation. If you work with a designer who has done work with historic buildings before, they can provide options. The commission can't design the project for you, but also can't give you a blanket approval. The commission will have to get a sense of what you are proposing before they can give you the approval to demolish part of the property. Homeowner's second question is regarding building an addition on the house that would be larger than the square footage of the original house—is it allowed and would the rest of the house need to be brought up to modern code? Commission deferred to the Building and Planning and Zoning departments on those questions and the question of setback on the lot. Homeowner asked whether the commission would consider a two-story addition since the house has been one story. Commissioner stated that this isn't a blanket yes or no question, but it really depends on what

you're proposing. This is an interesting design challenge—something that respects the original historic structure but that gives you what you're hoping for. It is likely doable but finding someone who can do this for you and who has experience with historic buildings might be a big challenge. Commissioner stated that the original historic structure should remain as is from the exterior. Best to leave that historic structure alone so that the new addition can be differentiated and you can have a bit more design freedom on the addition, while still being compatible. If you're talking about involving the primary footprint of the original house as part of the work, the commission and applicant will have more to discuss. Commission is open to ideas. Commissioner requested that the homeowner provide a drawing or lines drawn on the floorplan he has that show what he plans to demolish and what he plans to keep; that will be critical to any future decisions. Also helpful would be to have a drawing that shows the various additions so commission could understand this portion of the house is on a slab, this is on the crawlspace, and where the boundaries of those various areas are. Staff confirmed that the homeowners have Kurt Weiland's contact information so they could ask the building questions they have. They do.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

320 N Washington Street--asphalt roof to asphalt roof

115 Maple--asphalt roof to asphalt roof plus gutters and downspouts

19 N Hamilton--asphalt roof to asphalt roof; the panel covering their window must be removed.

Commission had no additional questions about those.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Property Monitoring

- a. Commissioners/Staff discussed property concerns and property issues under review.

2. Updates from Staff – two commissioners resigned and we are seeking new commissioners to fill those vacancies

3. Commissioner Comments—

- a. a concern about an outbuilding behind 305 S Washington Street. It appears to be suffering from demolition by neglect and may be unsafe. Also has a utility pole very close to it and it appears that DTE can't maintain that pole because this structure is too close. Staff will look into this and see what is happening with citations etc.
- b. Staff will also look into the history of depot enforcement and staff will document areas where the building is losing structural integrity or in danger of losing historic features.
- c. Commission would still like a clarifying meeting regarding infrastructure like sidewalks in the district, and staff will work on this.
- d. Commission comment that we need more clarification around noncontributing vs contributing. It is good to draw that distinction, but if that distinction is being based on old survey data, that could be a problem. How do we update that survey data so we're working with good data? Staff describes how we are overdue for a new survey and it is a project she is looking into, possibly partnering with the State Historic Preservation Office and possibly with Eastern Michigan University. Still looking into this and exploring this.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS—none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of August 23, 2022

Historic District Commission

August 23, 2022

6

Motion: Chesnut (second: Szumko) moved to approve the minutes of August 23, 2022, as submitted.

Approval: Voice vote. Unanimous.
Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

MEETING ADJOURNED at 9:00 p.m.