



MINUTES

City of Ypsilanti HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION Virtual Meeting held via Zoom

Tuesday, May 25, 2021
7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chairperson Pettit Video/telephone usage instructions given for potential attendees
Meeting called to order at 7:04pm

Commissioners Present: Alex Pettit – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti
Anne Stevenson – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti
Erika Lindsay – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti
Amy Swift – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti
James Chesnut – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti
James Ratzlaff – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Scott Slagor, Preservation Planner
Nancy Hare-Dickerson, Commission Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Lindsay (second: Chesnut) moved to approve the agenda as submitted.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Stevenson, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut, Ratzlaff
Nays: None
Absent: None
Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS—none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS

319 S Washington

**Windows.*

Applicants: Dan Gilbert, contractor - present
Aaron Yankee, Michigan Department of Health and Human Services - present

Discussion: *[Excerpt of Staff Review Notes: the application is for work completed without a permit. All wood windows on the house were replaced, 39 total, through a grant from the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) to remediate lead. The grant was federally funded, and therefore would have been reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Page 31 of 129 c.]*

Pettit: Provided a general overview of the discussion which took place at the May 11, 2021 HDC meeting, where action was tabled in order to allow applicant the ability to provide more information regarding the trim brick molding of the windows. Indicated that additional data was submitted. Asked applicant to discuss those proposed options.

Gilbert: Indicated that proposed option one would be to paint a set of windows in order to provide an example of what the window would look like if it was painted and finished. Stated an opinion that it would blend in with the trim much better.

Indicated that proposed option two would be to build out the mullions (the boards between windows within a single grouping) for the various serial window groupings on the porch and façade first-story windows, so that all the windows in the grouping are on the same plane; that they would not build out the outer trim, just the mullions between each window. Stated an opinion that, along with painting of the windows and the trim the same color as the existing trim, that that would make a big difference.

Indicated that proposed option three would be to remove the existing brick molding; however, that holds in the screen and in order to reinstall the screen, they would need to add a ¾-inch trim piece to hold in the screen.

[Discussion regarding the visual effect of the white window paint]

[Discussion regarding how one would properly flash a brick mold style window in this situation]

Chesnut: Indicated concern as to option number three *[discussion followed]*.

Gilbert: Stated that it is not an ideal solution but that it could be spieled properly. Stated that the best scenario would be to leave the existing brick mold that are on the windows in place *[discussion continued]*.

Swift: Indicated an opinion that option number three would be the only option she would consider as something that would move toward a solution. *[discussion followed]*

Stated that she would like to look at some details of the window construction.

Ratzlaff: Initiated discussion regarding applicant painting the trim and then coming back before the Commission.

Swift: Initiated discussion regarding appropriateness requirements for the Historic District.

Gilbert: Discussed past circumstances surrounding the project and reasons for work that was done.

Pettit: Discussed concerns regarding time constraint issues involved with option number one.

Swift: Discussed concerns as to setting precedent regarding painting over inappropriate work *[discussion followed as to alteration of trim concerns]*.

[Procedural discussion – best way to move forward]

Stevenson: Indicated that if this had been an application for proposed work that had not yet been completed, it would have been denied by the HDC as inappropriate *[discussion followed]*.

Gilbert: Reiterated past circumstances surrounding the project and reasons for work that was done.

Stevenson: Expressed that reiterating the reasons for the project are not helpful at this point. Indicated that the Commission has to look at the application as it has been presented and then make a decision on whether the work is appropriate under the Guidelines *[Commissioner Pettit acknowledged agreement]*.

Chesnut: Initiated further discussion as to possible remedies.

[Procedural discussion – best way to move forward]

Slagor: Staff advised that the HDC has only 60-days to act, which would be by the regularly scheduled meeting on June 8, 2021. Staff explained that in order to have a longer time for the Commission to make a decision, that an agreement would need to be reached, in writing, by the Commission and the applicant, to extend the time line. *[staff further discussed the process]*

Gilbert: Voiced a request for an extension.

[Continued discussion as to possible remedies]

Gilbert: Asked if the Commission is talking about removing the brick molding and creating some channel to hold the screen, or talking about eliminating the screen.

Chesnut: Indicated to applicant that the Commission is not able to design it but explained that the design created should remove the brick mold and have the flushest possible component holding the screen in.

Gilbert: Acknowledged *[discussed challenges]*.

[Clarifying discussion continued as to possible remedies, reference photo materials]

Pettit: Stated that seeing what the possibilities are could make all the difference. Stated that it would be important for applicant to come up with a visualization of what this would potentially look like, in cases where there is a single window as well as a series of windows together.

[Further clarifying discussion continued]
[Procedural discussion regarding extension considerations]

Motion: Chesnut (second: Ratzlaff) moved to table action on the proposed work at 319 S Washington so the applicant may continue to investigate ways to make the new window trim compatible. Critical points are removing the brick molding and producing a more compatible trim that does not stand proud of the existing; and providing options for the window sill, understanding that it would need to remain in place as installed with this particular window manufacturer.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Stevenson, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut, Ratzlaff
Nays: None
Absent: None
Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

421 N Adams

**Porch- Brick Veneer.*

Applicant: Andrew Rodriguez, owner - present

Discussion: Pettit: Asked applicant to discuss the proposed work.

Rodriguez: Indicated that the plan is to install brick veneer over the existing block on the porch. Stated that the brick will match the chimney *[briefly discussed history of the house]*.

Chesnut: Asked where it starts and terminates *[reference photo materials]*.

Rodriguez: Stated that it will terminate underneath the thickness of the slabs because the slab overhangs the block a little bit.

Chesnut: Asked about the steps.

Rodriguez: Stated that he would also like to do the concrete steps.

Chesnut: Asked for clarification on what portion of the steps.

Rodriguez: Stated that he would like to do every bit of the steps. *[discussion followed, reference brochure material]*.

Pettit: Asked if the steps are independent of the porch.

Rodriguez: Confirmed. *[clarifying discussion followed]*

[Discussion regarding the plane of the surface of the edge of the porch and the foundation]

Motion: Ratzlaff (second: Chesnut) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the

work at 421 N Adams as submitted in the application on May 10, 2021 for installation of a Royal Thin Brick veneer on the foundation of the façade porch as specified. The brick shall be laid in a stretcher bond and include corner pieces.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Stevenson, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut, Ratzlaff
Nays: None
Absent: None
Motion carried.

120 N Adams

**Roof/Gutters/Skylights.*

Applicant: Brad Fracalossi, owner- present

Discussion: Pettit: Indicated that applicant discussed proposed plans for skylights at the May 11, 2021 HDC meeting as a study item. Indicated that applicant has now come before the Commission with an application and several options for skylights. Asked applicant to walk the Commission through the three proposed options.

Fracalossi: Indicated that although four are listed, the preferred option would be to have three skylights installed (option three) – one on the east, one on the south of the back portion of the house and then one on the east on the back portion of the front of the house. *[clarifying discussion followed, reference diagram and photo materials]*.

Pettit: Asked how much the skylights protrude.

Fracalossi: Stated that they are very low-profile and that they do not open.

Ratzlaff: Asked if the skylights are tinted.

Fracalossi: Indicated, no.

Ratzlaff: Initiated discussion as to any attic lighting/possible light pollution.

Motion: Chesnut (second: Stevenson) moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 120 N Adams as submitted in the application on May 18, 2021 for roof and gutter replacements, and the addition of 3 Velux skylights as specified. The roof will be finished in architectural shingles with matching flashing and drip edge. The applicant may replace existing can vents but no new can vents shall be added. If possible, the Commission recommends removing the can vent on the façade dormer. Gutters shall be seamless K-style gutters in terratone and match current gutter configuration. The Velux skylights are permitted as presented in option three with the understanding that although they will be visible, they are on secondary elevations and have a minimal impact on historic integrity.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

#10- New work shall be removable.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Stevenson, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut, Ratzlaff

Nays: None

Absent: None

Motion carried.

311 E Forest

**Door.*

Applicant: Nikki Nabozny, owner - present

Discussion: Pettit: Indicated that the application is for replacement of a door. Asked applicant to describe to the Commission what is proposed.

Nabozny: Stated that the plan is to replace an existing Fiberglas door which is in poor condition. Indicated that the proposed replacement will be a Craftsman-style, three-over-three, white steel door [*reference materials*], which will be painted Bunglehouse Blue and will match the color of the shutters and the front door.

Pettit: Asked if it will fit the same opening.

Nabozny: Confirmed yes.

Pettit: Asked if any other adjustments are planned.

Nabozny: Confirmed no.

Motion: Stevenson (second: Chesnut) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 311 E Forest as submitted in the application on May 18, 2021 for replacing the east elevation door with a Jeld-Wen "Craftsman-style" steel door as specified, to be painted "Bunglehouse Blue" to match the shutters and front door.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

#10- New work shall be removable.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Stevenson, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut, Ratzlaff

Nays: None

Absent: None

Motion carried.

STUDY ITEMS—none

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

310 Olive **Roof**
101 S Washington **Roof**
213 Oak **Paint**

Motion: Stevenson (second: Lindsay) moved to accept the administrative approvals as cited above, submitted on May 25, 2021.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Stevenson, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut, Ratzlaff
 Nays: None
 Absent: None
 Motion carried.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Property Monitoring

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

2. Updates from Staff

Re: Michigan Historic Preservation Network conference/training – thank you to commissioners who attended.

Re: Commission/Staff acknowledgement of email correspondence received from Larry Yapp in regards to 24 N Huron [*discussion followed*].

3. Commissioner Comments

Commissioners, who wished, shared additional comments.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS—none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of May 11, 2021

Motion: Chesnut (second: Swift) moved to approve the minutes of May 11, 2021, as submitted.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Stevenson, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut, Ratzlaff
 Nays: None
 Absent: None
 Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

MEETING ADJOURNED at 9:15 p.m.