



MINUTES

City of Ypsilanti
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING
Ypsilanti Senior Citizens Center, 1015 Congress
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Tuesday, January 10, 2023 (approved February 14, 2023)
7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Alex Pettit Chair 7:05 PM

Commissioners Present: Alex Pettit, Delrhea Byrge, James Ratzlaff, Stefan Szumko, James Chesnut

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Ellen Thackery, Preservation Planner

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Ratzlaff (second: Szumko) moved to approve the agenda as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS- one comment read into the record, from Amy Doyle, attached

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS

201 E Cross

**Extension of the application review period*

Owner: Judy Weinburger, not present.

Staff: Commission will recall that this owner had installed vinyl windows on the front lower right (if one is looking at the house) without a review or permits. Commission had asked homeowner to measure wood windows in existence on the other side of the house and get a few other cost estimates for appropriate replacements. Getting the quotes and measurements took longer than expected, especially with the holidays. Applicant is requesting more time to furnish the commission with the necessary information. Commission rules allow staff to issue extension, but the extension must be approved by the Commission and both parties need to sign the extension agreement.

Discussion:

Motion: Szumko (second: Ratzlaff): Application PHDC 22-0025 for work at 201 E Cross, Unit 2, lacks information the HDC identifies as necessary to make a decision. The current deadline for commission action on this application is January 17, 2023. The applicant needs more time to gather the necessary information. I move to grant a 60-day extension of the commission's review period for Application PHDC 22-0025 so that the new deadline for commission action on this application is Friday, March 17, 2023 at 5:00 pm.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

307 N Washington

**Installation of solar panels*

Owner: Mark Maynard, present.

Staff: Proposal for the installation of solar panels on two roof slopes. One of the slopes is primary and the installation on that slope will be visible from the sidewalk. Staff noted that the proposal is mostly in line with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, the accompanying Guidelines, and also the local Guidelines (in the form of the City's Fact Sheets). Historic materials would not be harmed by the proposed work; the work, if removed, would not harm the historic property or historic materials; but, because the proposed work is on the primary elevation and visible from the public right of way, the work will diminish (but not destroy) historic character.

Discussion: Contractor stated that for them, this is simply a standard rooftop installation. Commissioner stated that he understood the perspectives that no historic material would be degraded, that the primary elevation could cause a concern, and he added that the roof angle on this house is a little more shallow than other houses in the area, and there is a little less to see from the street. There is a fair amount of tree growth there as well. The contractor handed out a picture of a typical two-story solar installation and noted that all of the components are black. (Photo of typical installation attached.) Commissioner noted that the proposal oriented the panels on this primary roof slope in two different directions. Could that be distracting when viewed—are there visible gaps between the panels? The rack system allows the panels to be so close that a viewer will not see big gaps between the panels. They are butted up against each other for the most part. Height of panels from roof? Contractor states that it's a little under 8" from roof surface to top of panel.

Commissioner stated that solar panels are a removable feature that improves quality of life and that the solar panels help to protect the building—they are hard and offer additional protection to the roof. In addition, these asphalt roof shingles are not a distinct roofing material to protect, like a Spanish clay tile for example. This is an emerging technology for us that much of the rest of the world has already incorporated and used on historic buildings. Contractor states that the roof pitch will minimize the impact from the street. Commissioner asked could the panel layout be adjusted so that all of the panels go in one direction, more like the image shown in the sample picture? Here, some panels go in one direction and others go in the other—could that be changed? Contractor

says that they do that wherever possible, but on this roof, the construction and building code requires the panels to meet certain standards for fire and safety and access and so sometimes it's not possible to have all of the panels in one direction. Commissioner points to *Figure 3* in the staff report and notes that the proposed installation would have the leading edge of the layout proposed as continuous, unlike how *Figure 3* shows the panels' bottom edges as staggered or toothed. Commissioner noted that this proposed installation would detract less from the historic character of the building than *Figure 3* would. In addition, this proposed installation has all of the equipment like the inverter away from the primary façade, and no vertical conduits that will come down the primary elevation. Contractor confirmed. Commissioner noted that current solar shingles when installed can detract from historic character as well and it is not clear whether those shingles are as efficient as panels. Commissioner notes, though, that as the technology evolves and gets better, commissions could see proposed rooftop solar installations that look just like shingles and would very likely meet the Standards easily.

Motion: Szumko moved (Chesnut seconded) to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the installation of 19 solar panels on the roof and an inverter near the southwest corner of the house at 307 N Washington as proposed in Application PHDC 22-0108 dated December 21, 2022 because the proposed work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 9 and 10.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

206-210 N Washington

**Determination of completeness for demolition application*

Owner: City of Ypsilanti. Other than preservation planner, no other City staff present. Applicant, Avalon Housing, represented by Michael Appel, David Esau, and Wendy Carty-Saxon, present.

Staff: First, even though this is not a public hearing, staff read a comment received into the record. *[Read attached comments.]* This application will not be new to any commissioners; commissioners saw this as a study item before and the task for tonight is to determine whether this application for demolition is complete. If the commissioners have the information they need in this application to be able to vote, then the commission could find this complete. If the commission feels they need a couple things, a commissioner could make a motion to find the application complete on the condition that a couple specific things are provided. If the commission feels that they need more than a few things in order to consider the application complete, it would be best practice to postpone the decision as to whether the application is complete until a later time when more information is received, and the commission could spell out the kinds of information that would make the application complete.

Some corrections for the record: The building history provided with the staff report noted that this history was for a Study Item. Staff noted that that terminology included is incorrect—this item before the commission is not a study item and staff will correct that in the documentation provided in the minutes. (See red strike-throughs and insertions on

the chronology attached.) Also, the building history provided indicates that the County is the owner—the City is actually the current owner and has owned the property since 2019. Lastly, Joe Meyers has since signed the application as the owner, as necessary, and staff will upload the updated documentation into the BSA system.

Staff noted that a site plan is needed, and that a simplified site plan is included here. Avalon confirmed that this site plan is very close to the completed site plan they will be submitting later in the week, and staff noted that a revised or new site plan could be shared with the commission and public as necessary. Avalon confirmed that the massing and scale shown in this application is a reasonable representation as to what the commission could expect to see when new construction is proposed.

Discussion: Commissioner noted that the applicant checked three boxes for “Grounds Upon Which an Application May Be Based”: The structure constitutes a hazard to the safety of the public or the occupants; The structure is a deterrent to a major improvement program that will be of substantial benefit to the community...; and Retaining the structure will cause undue financial hardship to the owner.... In order to justify demolition, each of these conditions requires a slew of documentation. We received lots of documentation, but this commissioner did not see a lot of documentation supporting the financial hardship criterion. It may not be strictly necessary because one criterion is enough for a compelling reason and for a notice to proceed by our ordinance, but commissioner flagged the concern here, because he sees a lot of documentation here but not the documentation that would support the financial hardship claim.

Applicant clarified that they will not be making a presentation at this meeting on the merits of the proposal but that they understand instead that this first review of the application is for completeness, and the actual presentation about the proposed demolition will be made at the next meeting about a month away. Applicant noted that all of the criteria in this case tie back to the process by which they came to be redeveloping the lot, and that is: the city owning a hazardous structure, wanting to redevelop it, choosing affordable housing as the public policy goal for the lot, and, to the applicant’s mind, that is the deterrent to the major improvement program. The City has determined the best use, and Avalon then determined that renovation, which is what Avalon expected to be able to do in the beginning, would not be feasible. Avalon checked the box for Financial Hardship on the application for demolition because “there is no pathway to finance affordable housing through the existing structure. It is that city goal, combined with our knowledge of affordable housing finance, and our ability to pull all together, that creates that financial hardship.”

Commissioner feedback. One commissioner explained that, regarding the financial hardship criterion, he would be looking for a pricing exercise that would say that there is a specific cost to keeping the structure intact or if there were a cost associated with maintaining the structure so it would not be a safety hazard. Could be a square footage estimate for the concept. This commissioner wants to see every bit of information so that the situation is clear before allowing demolition of a building for something new.

Another commissioner stated that, based on his experience, he imagines that the condition of this building would likely make retaining and maintaining this building for this purpose difficult. Other commissioner stated that he believes that that is based on some assumptions, because certainly buildings in bad condition have been rehabilitated for efficient new uses—that has certainly been done. The structural review here identifies a lot of the problems. Commissioner suspects that in the long run, structural requirements would limit design opportunities in getting units and revenue, and getting enough units to be the design they want would be one of the main challenges. But tearing down the building is a big step and will heavily impact the block. For *this* first step (review for completeness), it's about having the documentation to help make the decision.

A commissioner stated that the structural assessment included in the application appears to be thorough, although it doesn't put a number on the required work that would show a financial hardship for the City.

A commissioner noted that he mentioned the financial hardship criterion specifically as having a high burden of proof to meet in order to justify demolition because the commission's guidelines include strict language with this criterion. For example, the guidelines for this criterion for the commission state (available as part of the demolition application available on the Historic District website at <https://cityofpysilanti.com/263/Historic-District>):

"The Commission can and should require dollars and cents proof. The applicant must present written evidence sufficient to prove that all reasonable use and return will be lost if demolition or moving is denied. Simply showing some effect on value is not sufficient.

When considering financial hardship, the Commission may at its sole discretion consult experts (architects, engineers, appraisers, real estate analysts, market consultants, developers experienced in rehabilitation or reuse, etc.) to aid the Commission in determining if financial hardship exists, to research other uses for the property and to present evidence of reasonable financial use.

The applicant will have answered some of the following questions in his/her application. Nevertheless, the Commission must discuss them thoroughly when considering a claim of financial hardship.

1. Has the applicant tried to sell the property on its present site to a party willing to preserve?
2. Has the applicant tried to rent the property?
3. Has the applicant advertised the resource for sale or rental?
4. Has the applicant considered financially feasible alternate uses of the property which would allow its preservation?"

And it continues. Commissioner stated that it may not be necessary to try to make the case for financial hardship, but if financial hardship will be claimed, the commissioner is not seeing all of this documentation as part of this application.

Commissioner wondered if the City should be providing some of this information to the commission, since the City owns the property. Staff stated that she had spoken to the

department manager about some of these questions/concerns, and staff explained that the challenge for the city is that they have access to a housing fund, and they used it to purchase the property, but there is not money in the fund to rehabilitate the property. That's why the City issued the RFP and chose a partner to develop affordable housing on the site. Staff does not have, at this moment, the figures as requested earlier showing an apples-to-apples comparison of rehab costs vs demolition costs to develop affordable housing on this site, but staff did have the conversation about the city's inability to complete the development on their own without a partner. In addition, some of the financial incentives that are available to developers to do this work aren't available to the city because the city doesn't have income tax liability that make the available credits valuable.

Commissioner reminded that one piece of the challenge is that the commission is not charged with reviewing the financial situation of the owner, but is instead charged with reviewing the PROPERTY's financial situation.

Applicant offered that there may be part of an answer to this financial hardship question in that the former owner was not able to rehabilitate the property and lost it due to unpaid taxes. Whether they were unable or unwilling is a question the commission could ask. One commissioner offers that pages 74 and 75 of the packet gives a laundry list of what needs to be done to make the building habitable; keeping the same number of apartments, the rent the owner would have to charge would likely be increased. That seems to this commissioner part of that financial hardship piece. Applicant stated that other developers in addition to the last owner probably looked at the property and decided it was not feasible; Avalon seeks not to make a profit but to house people. Commissioner stated that that goal is understood and reasonable, but wanted to note that commission has also seen people develop properties that have seemed to others undevelopable but they, for whatever reason, are willing to make it work and take on the project, and cited the Thompson Block as a case in point. Commissioner stated that this structure has seen so much and has been through so much, and acknowledged that those changes complicate its redevelopment.

Commissioner noted that pages 74-75 are part of the architectural report and that the structural report concludes that the foundation and the exterior are in generally salvageable shape. That seems a priority consideration to this commissioner. As the engineer's report states, "Any structure can get salvaged at a cost," and so this commissioner finds it difficult to accept demolition in this case when the structural report finds the foundation and exterior generally salvageable. That said, this commissioner would lean on overall benefit to the community the commission serves and weighs the benefit of what is being proposed and the design and the community benefit against the loss of this building and the commission's responsibility to the Standards.

Staff reminds the commission that the paper trail--having the information on the record--is so important. If a decision is ever appealed, having the necessary information on the record is vital. The commission should feel free to request whatever information is necessary to create that public record. And a commissioner reminds that other, later

applicants may look to the record on this case and try to urge the commission to decide similarly based on similar information.

Commissioner asked about the major improvement program criterion and applicant explained that their intention with that criterion was that the city had chosen to issue an RFP to create affordable housing on this parcel (the major improvement program that will be of substantial benefit to the community), and the applicant who was selected to provide that housing determined that they could not use the existing building to provide that housing, so the existing building was a deterrent. Applicant team believes that they could not get funding for this project trying to use the existing building. The stairways would be problematic, and the units would be so small that funders would say they could invest elsewhere for a better end result.

Commissioner asked how can the City be a better steward of the property it owns—how can this building be better secured and made watertight? Staff will take that concern back to the City.

Applicant explained the timeline that will likely apply here. If MSHDA HOME funds are awarded, demolition and then new construction could begin about February 2024. If those funds are not awarded, another funding source would be sought, and, if that is successful, demolition and construction would begin about fall 2024.

Commission sought clarification on project scenario. There have been past times where the city finds itself with a proposed demolition but no approved construction plans and then the project stalls and the city has an empty lot. In this case, however, the demolition would not begin until the project funding is secured and the new construction plans are approved.

Commissioner sought better understanding of what the commission's task is at this meeting—staff clarified that commission is determining whether they have sufficient information at hand to make a decision about the demolition. They are not deciding on demolition tonight, but instead are deciding if they have the information needed to schedule the public hearing and get to the next step.

Commissioner asked whether there could be any architectural salvage on materials that are still usable. Applicant is open to that possibility but noted that much of the visible wood is either fire damaged or waterlogged. Applicant would be interested in sending materials elsewhere for reuse, but likely could not reuse the materials in the new construction.

Commissioners discussed whether the building's contributing/noncontributing status affects the decision, and the fact that the building was considered noncontributing at the time of the nomination, but might well be considered contributing now since the architect's legacy is better appreciated and this was his office for about 30 years.

Commissioner asked about environmental status of the property. Applicant explained that they've had a phase 1 and phase 2 environmental study. There's no environmental

contamination, but there is asbestos in the building that will need to be abated before demolition, and likely lead, but the site is appropriate for housing. The soil borings along the property line where the car repair shop had been all came back with no concerns. Commissioner asked if bats had been located, and applicant stated that the required review for endangered species act has not been done yet, but it will.

Commission and applicant discussed process going forward. Several commissioners indicated there was enough information here for them to make a decision, but two commissioners indicated that they'd need more financial information. One commissioner indicated he would want to see a full set of cost estimates for repairing and rehabilitating the building, as well as the cost for demo and new construction. Another commissioner agreed that the demolition guidelines support that request. Commissioner wants to see that it is clear and evident that the costs and both scenarios (demo + new construction vs rehabilitation of existing) were thoroughly investigated. Applicant explained that they did not complete that exercise entirely because as they began that exercise, the inconsistent sections of the building and the structural damage that needs to be repaired and brought up to code made evident early on that if the applicant reused any portion of the existing building, between damage to the existing elements and the structural problems between the elements, there was no ability to rebuild the building as it was. The end result would have been that you were going to spend the same or more to build a new building within the existing wall and get a lesser product. A big part of the problem is unseen—Avalon doesn't have funding outside of the funding provided by the grants and tax credits they get. So if an unforeseen issue becomes apparent, there is no additional funding to mitigate it like a private developer might have. Applicant will try to organize the info regarding financials so that the commission can better see that information. The applicant plans to gather some of the cost data needed and submit it to the staff for distribution with the February packet.

Motion: Ratzlaff moved (seconded by Szumko) to accept as complete Application PHDC 23-0002 dated January 3, 2023 for the proposed demolition of the existing building at 206-210 N Washington, and move to schedule a public hearing for the next historic district commission meeting, scheduled February 14, 2023. Staff will execute necessary tasks (publishing notice of hearing, notifying necessary neighbors of hearing, etc.) in order to hold the public hearing February 14, 2023. This motion is *not* a motion to approve demolition. No demolition can begin on site at this time.

Approval: Three ayes, two nays. Motion carried.

STUDY ITEMS—none

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS—none

OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Property monitoring**
- 2. Updates from Staff**

- a. Two commissioner terms were to end at the end of 2022; those commissioners were reappointed in December.
- b. The appeal for the case of vinyl windows on N Washington has closed; closing briefs were submitted and now we are waiting on the verdict.
- c. Staff is working on a grant application to get the local historic district resurveyed. Then perhaps we could update the study committee report from 1978 to meet modern standards. Grant application requires a letter of support from the commission. Because commission rules do not allow one commissioner to represent the whole commission, staff is requesting a resolution allowing a letter of support to be submitted with the grant application written on behalf of the whole commission but signed by only the chair.

3. Commissioner comments

- a. Pen Dam park concerns. Currently dam, building, and sign are historic resources on site, but are not protected. City has decided to remove dam; other elements would remain, but latest inspection report from November 2022 indicates some concerns. Some citizens have indicated interest in possibly protecting the building and the sign.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS- none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

1. Draft Minutes from December 13, 2022

Motion: Ratzlaff moved (second: Szumko) to approve the draft minutes for December 13, 2022 as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

2. Adoption of resolution allowing a letter of support to be submitted with grant application

Staff: See staff comments above.

Motion: Chesnut (second: Ratzlaff) moved to approve the adoption of the resolution allowing a letter of support to be submitted with the grant application.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

MEETING ADJOURNED at 9:54 p.m.

Full Minutes Prepared By: Ellen Thackery

SOLAR KING DISTRIBUTED THIS IMAGE AS AN EXAMPLE
OF A TYPICAL INSTALLATION, JAN 10, 2023 HISTORIC DISTRICT
Solar King, LLC COMMISSION

Typical Roof Top Installation



Email received containing public comments, dated Tuesday, January 10, 2023, read into record at the Historic District Commission meeting 1/10/23

HDC meeting of 1/10/23 re: 206-210 N. Washington St.



Amy Doyle <[REDACTED]>

To Ellen Thackery



Tue 5:48 PM

 You replied to this message on 1/10/2023 5:53 PM.

Hello, Ms. Thackery.

I live at 210 S. Washington St., and am interested in the affordable housing project proposed by Avalon Housing.

Although I'm unable to attend tonight's meeting, I did review the agenda packet. Based on my initial impression, the proposal looks reasonable to me. I'd really like to see that burned-out, vacant building gone (even more since reading about its condition), and I'm supportive of the mission of more affordable housing in Ypsilanti, especially when coordinated by such a reputable organization as Avalon Housing.

I look forward to learning more, and hope to attend the upcoming public hearing.

Amy Doyle

206-210 N Washington ~~Demolition Study Item Chronology~~ (Updated 1/13/23, see strike-throughs and additions in red)

The property at 206-210 N Washington includes an office/apartment building and two ancillary buildings: a hen house and carriage barn. The apartment/office building suffered a fire on January 1, 2017. Demolition by Neglect proceedings began September 7, 2018. The property entered tax foreclosure on April 2, 2019 and ~~is now~~ **was** owned by Washtenaw County **until August 2019 when the City of Ypsilanti purchased it**. The building's stability has been compromised due to the fire and it is on the city's dangerous buildings list. ~~Washtenaw County proposes demolishing all structures on the property, including the apartment/office building and its two ancillary buildings.~~ The City determined that affordable housing should be made available on site, issued a Request for Proposals (RFP), and selected Avalon Housing as the partner for this project in 2020. The proposed development proposes preservation of the two outbuildings behind the existing office/apartment building and demolition of the existing office/apartment building.

Property History

The building has been through many changes and alterations. Based on photos on file, the original building was a two-story Italianate house with a rear modest Queen Anne-style addition. Original house appears to date to ca.1860 while the rear addition dates to ca.1885. The property was first illustrated on a Sanborn Map in 1888, which depicted the footprint of the original house with the rear addition.¹ The map also noted four ancillary buildings on site. Northeast of the house was a wood house, ash house (both not extant), and hen house (extant). The fourth outbuilding appears to have been a carriage barn, located southeast of the house (extant). By 1916 the hen house had been converted to a garage.² The wood house and ash house were removed by 1927, and both the hen house and carriage barn were converted garages.³

By the 1930s a one-story ell had been added to the south elevation, but the overall exterior of the house had changed little. By the 1940s however, the building had been substantially altered by the addition of a third floor, and removal of the front porch for a one-story stone-clad entrance pavilion. A sign on the addition indicates it was the offices of notable Ypsilanti Architect, R. S. Gerganoff; who appears to have remodeled the rest of the building as well. Based on blueprints on file in the Planning Department, Gerganoff modernized the building ca. 1955, altering the façade, expanding the south ell, and adding the Modern features seen today. Photos from this period have not yet been identified.

R. S. Gerganoff

Rashko Stoyan Gerganoff was born January 19, 1887 in Kereka, Bulgaria.⁴ He immigrated to the United States in 1905 and worked as a cabinet maker before enrolling in the architecture program at the University of Michigan in 1910, graduating in 1917. He completed the State Board in 1920, the same year he became a citizen, and changed his name to Ralph Stephens Gerganoff.⁵ He worked for the Detroit firm Donaldson and Meier before establishing his own practice in Ypsilanti in 1925. Among his

¹ Sanborn Map Publishing, *Ypsilanti, Michigan*, (New York: Sanborn Map Publishing Co., 1888), 4.

² Sanborn, *Ypsilanti, Michigan*, (1916), 5.

³ Sanborn, *Ypsilanti, Michigan*, (1927), 14.

⁴ Peg Porter, "R. S. Gerganoff: An Architect for the 20th Century," *Ypsilanti Gleanings*

⁵ Porter, "R. S. Gerganoff," 3.

early projects in Ypsilanti was the Neoclassical-style Counselor Apartment building at 108 Washtenaw, which he owned. Early designs by Gerganoff appear to have favored Period Revival Styles.

In the 1930s he designed the City Printing building on West Cross Street and a number of projects for Michigan State Normal College (now Eastern Michigan University).⁶ At this time, Gerganoff's buildings adopted elements of Modernism, such as the popular Art Deco and Art Moderne styles. Among his projects at the Normal College were multiple residences halls, Pierce Hall, and the Rackham School. It appears that during this period, his offices moved into the building at 206-210 N. Washington.

In 1947, Gerganoff brought his nephews Stoyan (Steve) and Zdravka (Zack) to Ypsilanti from Bulgaria.⁷ He put them through architecture school and employed them in his firm. During the mid-century the Gerganoff firm designed numerous schools in Ypsilanti, including the Chapelle School and West Junior High School. Other works included commercial buildings across Washtenaw County, and the Beyer Hospital in Ypsilanti. By this time, Gerganoff had heavily implemented the principles of Modernism into his designs, including his own home at 1330 Huron River Drive. His office building at 206-210 N Washington was remodeled in 1955 with an expanded office wing and Modern façade. R. S. Gerganoff died in 1966. The firm was succeeded by Stoyan Gerganoff, and later by Zdravka Gerganoff in 1980.⁸

Property Significance

According to the Ypsilanti Historic District National Register nomination, 206-210 N Washington is non-contributing to the district. The nomination does not mention the hen house or carriage barn. The local Ypsilanti Historic District listing does not denote contributing/non-contributing buildings, but in order to make defensible decisions, the HDC should consider the current NRHP listing as the guide.

Staff recommends that the principal building, 206-210 N. Washington, is significant under Criterion B, for its association with the productive life of R. S. Gerganoff. Gerganoff was a major local architect with works across the state. The building appears to have served as his offices for approximately 30 years.

Staff also recommends that the two ancillary buildings, the hen house and carriage house, be considered contributing to the Historic District. These outbuildings contribute to the district's setting, and embody the ways residential neighborhoods have changed over the years. Staff has not yet conducted research into the outbuildings' context; the intact henhouse, however, is possibly unique within the historic district.

Potential Demolition Mitigations

Washtenaw County would be interested with a mitigation agreement with the HDC to allow demolition. Staff has identified possible mitigation measures to include:

- Full documentation and a report on the property, to be kept on file at the Ypsilanti Historical Society.
- A report and/or survey on the works of the Gerganoff firm in Ypsilanti, to be kept on file with the City, Ypsilanti Historical Society, and Ypsilanti Public Library.
- Finding a way to move or preserve the outbuildings.

⁶ Porter, "R. S. Gerganoff," 20.

⁷ Porter, "R. S. Gerganoff," 21.

⁸ A2Modern, Ralph Gerganoff, accessed April 23, 2019, <http://www.a2modern.org/architects/ralph-gerganoff/>.

- Erecting an interpretive marker or markers at sites related to Gerganoff.
- Supporting a historic walking tour of Gerganoff buildings.

Photographic Timeline of 206-210 N. Washington. Historical photos are courtesy of Ypsilanti Historical Society.



206-210 N. Washington, ca. 1900. Photo looking northeast to façade and south elevation.



206-210 N. Washington, ca. 1900. Photo looking northwest to east and south elevations.



206-210 N. Washington, ca. 1900. Photo looking southwest to east and north elevations.



206-210 N. Washington, ca. 1930. Photo looking northeast to facade and south elevations. Note the one-story office addition.



206-210 N. Washington, ca. 1940. Photo looking northeast to facade and south elevations. Note the addition of the third floor and the carriage barn behind the one-story office wing.



206-210 N. Washington, 2019. Photo looking east to facade.



206-210 N. Washington, 2019. Photo looking northeast to façade and south elevation.



206-210 N. Washington, 2019. Photo looking southeast to façade and north elevation.



206-210 N. Washington, north carriage barn, 2019. Photo looking west to east elevation.



206-210 N. Washington, north carriage barn, 2019. Photo looking northeast to south and west elevations.



206-210 N. Washington, south carriage barn, 2019. Photo looking southeast to north and west elevations.