

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes
July 19, 2005
DRAFT

City Commission Chambers
2nd Floor, City Hall
241 W. South Street
Kalamazoo, MI 49007

Members Present: Bill Snyder, Chair; Lisa Poole-Woldring, Vice Chair;
Fred Decker; Linda DeYoung; Nelson Nave; Bob Oudsema; James
Tribu

City Staff: Sharon Ferraro, Historic Preservation Coordinator; Amy Thomas,
Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Snyder called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m.

DISCLAIMER

Ms. Ferraro read the disclaimer into the record.

AGENDA (July 19, 2005)

Ms. Ferraro requested that 611 West South Street be added to the end of the agenda.

**Ms. Poole-Woldring, supported by Mr. Nave, moved approval of the July 19, 2005
Historic District Commission Agenda as amended. With a voice vote, the motion
carried unanimously.**

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

OLD BUSINESS

410 W. Dutton (Case # IHA 05-0107)

Shaun Willis appeared to represent the property. The application requests demolition of a
small un-needed shed/garage at the northwest corner of the property.

Mr. Willis was present at the June HDC meeting and was advised by the commission of the need for more details about the proposed project. Mr. Willis provided drawings of his proposal for how the area would look if the shed/garage were removed. He stated that the fence will also be removed but the trees are to remain. The landscaping will be updated to tie in with the neighboring property.

Mr. Willis advised that the main reason for removal of the shed/garage is that a portion of it is on the neighboring property owned by Diekema Hamann. The shed/garage was built at a different time than the house, the wood on the shed/garage is not in keeping with the Dutton house and the trim is also different. The shed/garage windows are broken out, the doors have been replaced with plywood and the overhangs are inconsistent with the house. The addition on the shed encroaches the neighboring property. There have been multiple security problems regarding the shed/garage. Removal of the shed/garage would provide an extra parking space. There are three people at the Dutton office and there are not enough parking spaces; the property is zoned commercial. Employees at the Dutton address may only park for two hours at a time on the street. Mr. Willis advised that Mark Pulver of Pulver Construction, Inc., was present at the meeting to answer questions about the proposed demolition and removal of the fence.

Mr. Nave stated that he had put together a list of responses to Mr. Willis' concerns. Mr. Nave stated that most of the code problems are grandfathered in and that he could find no reason to have the shed/garage demolished. Mr. Willis expressed concern that he was just receiving Mr. Nave's responses at the meeting.

Mr. Nave suggested removing the "dog house" extension on the north end of the garage so that the remaining building would be only 6 inches over the line. Mr. Willis stated that the building would still be over the line and that he might be sued as a result. Mr. Nave stated that he talked with Norm Hamann from Diekema Hamann Architects and Mr. Hamann didn't seem concerned about the shed/garage being on his property. Mr. Willis expressed concern that Mr. Nave had not spoken with Steve Hassevort at Diekema Hamann regarding this situation.

Mr. Ferraro advised that an entire block on north Burdick could come down if issues of encroachment were enforced. She further stated that demolition was not the only possible redress for that type of problem. Mr. Oudsema pointed out that the situation with the encroachment existed when Diekema-Hamann bought the building and that the applicant was under no obligation to take the shed/garage down because of the encroachment.

The HDC and the applicant were in agreement that Mr. Nave's letter dated July 18, 2005 responding to Mr. Willis' concerns about 410 Dutton could be made part of the record and that it was not necessary to read the letter into the record.

Mr. Oudsema inquired if the applicant was requesting that the area under the shed/garage be black-topped or if he would be willing to make it a green space. Mr. Willis advised that parking was the issue but that he would agree to green space if that was necessary. Mr. Pulver stated that there was more than enough room for three parking spaces and it would be possible to have green space and parking if the shed/garage were removed. There is approximately 67' from the sidewalk to the back. Parking spaces need to be 18' deep minimum but they are usually 20'. There could be three 20-foot deep parking spaces plus a 7'8" green space. Mr. Oudsema inquired about the size of the green space between the wood deck and the property line and suggested carrying that band of green space across the property. Mr. Willis advised that the existing green space was about 10 to 14 feet and the deck takes up about the same amount of space.

Mr. Oudsema inquired if Diekema Hamann intended to leave their green space as is. Mr. Willis stated that Diekema Hamann was agreeable with having Willis and Willis tie in their green space with the existing landscaping.

Ms. DeYoung inquired if the Mustang or Jeep Grand Cherokee could be parked in the garage/shed if it were restored. Mr. Willis advised that he thought the Jeep would probably not fit in the garage. Mr. Oudsema stated that he was the prior owner of the property and advised that he didn't think either vehicle would fit in the shed/garage.

Mr. Oudsema stated that he was inclined to agree with the demolition of the shed/garage provided that the green space in back could be carried the full length of the property. He added that the shed/garage is really not functional in size for cars but that it could be used for storage. Mr. Oudsema mentioned that if the shed/garage caught fire, its close proximity to the house could put the house in danger also. Mr. Oudsema commented that the owner is improving the house and it's in better shape than before. He stated that loss of the storage structure would not adversely affect the neighborhood if the owner extended the existing green space to the western property line, removed the fence and enhanced the immediate area.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Decker, moved to allow the demolition of the shed/garage at 410 W. Dutton if the existing green space across the back is carried the full width of the property (the green space on the north property line to the existing deck is to be extended to the western property line). The width of the new green space is to be consistent with the width of the existing green space and is not to be paved over. With a roll call vote, the motion carried by a majority vote.

Discussion continued with regard to the proposed demolition. Mr. Nave expressed concern that the historic district is losing too many garages and that he would be voting against the motion.

The applicant advised that he thought Mr. Oudsema's motion was a good compromise; the shed area will be filled with grass instead of concrete. There are old substances stored in the shed and it's close to the house so fire is a concern.

Ayes: Decker, Snyder, Oudsema, Tribu

Nays: Nave, DeYoung, Poole-Woldring

Ms. Ferraro advised the applicant that he would be receiving a Notice to Proceed in the mail and that he was cleared to proceed with his proposed project.

445 Stuart (Case #: IHA-05-0107)

Jay Bonsignore appeared to represent the property. The application requests re-roofing to standards and removal and reconstruction of the second-floor bay window on the north side.

Mr. Bonsignore appeared at the June meeting and was advised by the HDC to return with more details on the project. Mr. Bonsignore provided a cardboard model of the bay window showing the changes he was proposing. He stated that animals are currently invading the area over the bay and under the roof area. Accordingly, he presented two options for enclosing the area and eliminating this problem. He also provided an example of the proposed support underneath the bay window.

Discussion followed with regard to the details of the project and the members of the HDC expressed support for the first option presented.

Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Oudsema, moved to accept the first roofing scheme and rebuilding of the bay and the triangular enclosure underneath the bay at 445 Stuart. The siding is to be at a 45-degree angle coming down to almost a point under the bay. The old brackets are to be stored in the house. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Snyder inquired as to the details of the soffits and Mr. Bonsignore provided a drawing showing the details. Mr. Bonsignore stated that he would be adding about 3½ to 4" of fascia. He also stated that he would be adding foam insulation and a vent in the roof area over the bay.

Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Oudsema, moved to accept the details of the soffits for 445 Stuart as presented. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if it was possible to get an extension. Ms. Ferraro advised that the approval was good for six months and he could call for an extension if necessary.

NEW BUSINESS

237 Stuart (Case #: IHA 05-0144)

Ian Neilsen was present to discuss the application. The application requests replacement of all damaged and intact wooden clapboard siding with Hardiplank smooth-faced clapboard siding to match existing siding in dimensions and reveal.

Mr. Neilsen advised that the house was left open for eight or nine months after a fire. He advised that he had a sample of the textured Hardiplank but not the smooth.

Mr. Snyder commented that this was the first case in the Kalamazoo Historic District that someone had proposed to use Hardiplank siding. Ms. Ferraro advised that she had spoken with Robb McKay at the State Historic Preservation Office, who deals with federal tax credits and Brian Lijewski who deals with the Michigan tax credit. Mr. McKay advised the following: "The replacement of severely damaged wood siding with cement fiber siding is acceptable provided that the overall appearance of the building remains predominantly unchanged and the material is smooth." Mr. Lijewski advised, "I am in agreement with Robb but will add that we do independently review existing conditions to determine if limited replacement is feasible or total replacement is warranted. If we conclude that total replacement is warranted, a fiber cement siding may be an option. In these types of projects it is very important to get an application in and reviewed prior to the start of any work so that we are all on the same page." Ms. Ferraro stated that, in terms of the tax credit, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation state that material should be the same where possible. That doesn't necessarily mean that it always has to be exactly the same material but the dimensions, the appearance, the texture and everything else should be the same.

The applicant advised that he would probably not apply for the tax credit. Mr. Oudsema inquired as to the cost of the Hardiplank. Mr. Neilsen stated that the Hardiplank would be significantly cheaper. Mr. Neilsen stated that he hoped to purchase the Hardiplank with a pre-painted finish, which is guaranteed for 15 years. Mr. Neilsen stated that he has used the Hardiplank on other projects and it has a crisp, clean appearance and lasts for a long time. He mentioned that the bed and breakfast next door was painted about four years ago and already needs to be redone.

Mr. Oudsema inquired as to the timeframe for the project. Mr. Neilsen stated that he would like to start on at least once this year, probably by the driveway. The project will take quite awhile to complete since the intention is to install the Hardiplank all around the house including the enclosed porches.

Ms. Ferraro advised that the topic of Hardiplank came up in a chat room discussion. Some historic districts only allow Hardiplank on new, accessory buildings and not on the primary structure and they don't allow it on additions but no one has said they would

disallow it as a total replacement. They don't want to see the difference between the old, worn siding and the new siding because it would be too much of a contrast. She added that she has only heard good things about this product so far.

Mr. Oudsema commented that this structure was about to be taken down and that he thought this would be a good opportunity to try out this product. Mr. Snyder mentioned that surface preparation and the type of products used make a difference in how long it lasts. He further commented that he thought this was an excellent opportunity to evaluate new material in the historic district and that he would be voting in favor of it.

Mr. Decker inquired as to how the siding would be attached. Mr. Neilsen stated that he would use a pneumatic siding nailer and it will be predrilled at the joints on the inside corners to prevent splitting. He stated that he would be replacing the corner boards with yellow pine and putting up extra studs. Vertical trim will be salvaged where possible.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Nave, moved approval of the replacement of all damaged wood clapboard at 237 Stuart. The replacement is to be Hardiplank smooth-faced clapboard siding to match the existing siding in dimensions and reveals. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

1304 Merrill (Case #IHA 05-0165)

Jennifer McVey appeared to represent the property. The application requests removal of the 2nd floor exterior stairway on the north side of the house and replacement of the now unneeded 2nd floor door with a double-hung wooden window. The application also requests the addition of a 1st floor mudroom outside the north side first floor door.

The applicant requested that item #3, the mudroom entrance, be postponed until next month so further details can be provided. Ms. McVey stated that she is in the process of converting the duplex into a single-family home. She requested advice from the HDC about the original door, the opening and the window because it isn't obvious what was originally there. She referred to 1220 Merrill as an example of what might have been used. Ms. Ferraro advised that, typically, you would have a standard-size window or slightly larger in a staircase; this window is by the landing. Ms. Lindemann asked if she should clarify the details with Ms. Ferraro once the structure is opened up. Mr. Snyder concurred with that suggested plan of action.

Ms. Poole-Woldring, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved approval of the removal of the 2nd floor exterior stair on the north side of the house at 1304 Merrill and replacement of the door with a window. The details are to be worked out with the Historic Preservation Coordinator. All work to historic district standards and guidelines. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

411 Mitchell (Case # IHA 04-0246)

Scott Sullivan was present to discuss the application. The application requests replacement of the missing windows at the 2nd floor rear of the house with wooden casement windows.

Mr. Sullivan stated that he wants to bring the property up to historic standards with casement windows. Mr. Sullivan provided pictures of the house and gave a brief explanation of the proposed project. Ms. Ferraro has reviewed the property and advised that she thinks the house had casement windows, probably double casement windows in the larger openings. Mr. Sullivan stated that he has been working with someone at Lowe's and was given a quote for Pella windows which he was told were approved by the HDC in the past. Mr. Sullivan commented that the replacement windows are expensive and he inquired if anyone could suggest an alternative.

Mr. Nave inquired if the sleeping porch existed on both corners in the back. Ms. Ferraro stated that there were originally two pairs of paired casement windows facing the back of the house. On the side there was a pair of casements in the center flanked by a single casement on each side. Discussion continued with regard to the original configuration of that portion of the house and how it looks now. Mr. Sullivan explained that the house was a duplex and was turned back into a single-family home before he bought it. The space with the many windows was likely a sleeping porch. There are four original windows remaining out of 16 total on the sun porch.

Discussion followed with regard to the most economical way to replace the windows. Mr. Nave suggested saving money by making a portion of the windows non-operational. Ms. Ferraro added that 45% of the windows in a room need to be operational to meet code. If egress is an issue, the big, double casement window should be operational and not have a center post. Ms. Ferraro stated that the windows should be wood inside and out and Mr. Nave mentioned that eliminating the aluminum-clad portion of the windows would also save money. Mr. Snyder suggested giving the owner the option of leaving the original windows and restoring them or replacing all of the windows for uniformity if the original windows are in bad shape.

The conversation turned to the dimensions of the windows and Mr. Sullivan stated that the stock Pella windows are an inch too tall for the opening. Concern was expressed that stock windows from other companies might also present the same problem and it was suggested that further research be done with the final selection to be approved by the Historic Preservation Coordinator.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. Poole-Woldring, moved to allow the owner to replace the missing windows on the second floor, rear of 411 Mitchell providing that the final window selection is approved by the Historic Preservation Coordinator. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Snyder inquired if the approval was for 8-paneled, wood windows. Ms. Ferraro answered in the affirmative and stated that the replacement windows would be as close to the original windows as possible.

610 W. South Street (Case #: IHA 05-0174)

Nelson Nave was present to discuss the application. The application requests repair of the back of the carriage house (discussion) and replacement or repair of the plaster siding below the second story window sills with board and batten. The application also requests repair and expansion of the steps to the “man door” of the carriage house on the south side.

Mr. Nave stated that the exit from the addition on the east side of the house is in bad shape. The stoop is not original to the property and it is severely deteriorated. Mr. Nave stated that he would like to replace the stoop with a sloped porch, similar to a front porch but without a roof. It would be approximately 6 feet deep and the width of the addition. Mr. Snyder requested clarification of the drawings and Mr. Nave approached the bench to provide the requested details. Mr. Nave mentioned that he'd had luck with clear, epoxy paint over colored paint on the newel posts on the front porch. This process was done six years ago and still looks good; the intention is to repeat this process on the stoop.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved to allow the demolition of the existing stoop and the building of a new porch for 610 W. South Street on the north, rear side of the glass addition which is on the east side of the house. All work to be done per the detailed information on the application. With a roll call vote, the motion carried by a majority vote. Mr. Nave abstained.

610 W. South (Case #: IHA 05-0175)

Nelson Nave was present to discuss the application. The application requests removal of the old back porch, the addition of a new, larger porch in the same location to HDC specifications. The porch is to extend across the entire rear width of the north side of the two-story sun porch addition on the east side of the house.

Repairs to stucco

Mr. Nave stated that there are numerous cracks in the stucco underneath the second floor sills and there are big sections of it missing near the ground. He provided further details regarding problems with the stucco and inquired if the Commission had suggestions on how it could be repaired. Mr. Nave advised that one option might be to cut a line around the bottom of the second floor sills, leaving the original stucco on top and then put board and batten siding below with a drip edge at the top and trim out the board and batten

siding top and bottom. Another option would be to fix the stucco but it is about ½” thick and it would be difficult to match the original.

Mr. Snyder suggested introducing a trim element such as the drip edge as a division so the difference between the old and new stucco wouldn't be as noticeable. Mr. Nave stated that the stucco would need to be removed from the ground up to the second floor sill. Mr. Oudsema suggested replacing the bottom portion of the stucco with Hardiplank or some other material. Mr. Nave stated that he found someone who thought he could match the stucco. Ms. Ferraro stated that she would be able to approve repair in kind. Mr. Snyder suggested comparing the price differential between patching the stucco and replacing it entirely. Mr. Nave stated that replacing the stucco entirely would be more expensive than patching the stucco or replacing it with board and batten.

Back of garage

Mr. Nave advised that the prior owner installed particle board with studs and installed lattice between the columns. Mr. Nave stated that he would like to take the wall out and start over. He hopes to explore options for replacing it since the current structure is too close to the carriage barn and makes access to the carriage barn difficult. Mr. Nave suggested further investigation by starting the repairs and then making a decision on the front and back. Since this proposal involves removal of non-original elements, a motion was not necessary. It was suggested that Mr. Nave return to the HDC with a proposal after he has had time to investigate the situation.

Steps in front by the “man door” by the garage door

Mr. Nave stated that he wants to make the landing about three feet deeper so the door can be opened while you're standing on the landing. Mr. Oudsema suggested opening the back of the garage to see what's there and then coming back to the HDC with more details.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Decker, moved to allow Mr. Nave to open the rear of the garage at 610 W. South Street to determine the best way to approach the project and then return to the HDC with further details. An additional 3 feet is to be added on to the landing in front of the “man door” of the garage. With a roll call vote, the motion carried by a majority vote. Mr. Nave abstained.

611 W. South Street

The applicant was not present at the meeting. Mr. Snyder stated that the requested details, including measurements, were not provided by the applicant and, therefore, he was not inclined to consider this request. He requested review of the last motion on this application. Ms. Ferraro advised that the applicant received approval in concept at the last HDC meeting and he was advised to return for approval of the details of the entry

and the roof. Mr. Snyder inquired as to the 60-day time limit for the HDC to make a decision. Ms. Ferraro advised that the HDC has 60 days to make a decision from the time the application is first submitted. The clock stopped ticking when the approval in concept was granted at the last meeting. The 60 days will be up at the August meeting and the HDC must make a ruling at that point.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. Poole-Woldring, moved to deny the application for 611 W. South Street based on the lack of information from the applicant. If adequate information is provided by the August meeting, the Historic District Commission will reconsider the application.

Mr. Snyder stressed that the HDC was very explicit about the information they needed but no further details were forthcoming from the applicant.

With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

511 W. Vine

Ms. Ferraro stated that the Vine Neighborhood Association is sponsoring a kids' art camp this summer. The final project is to be a mural painted on plywood panels. The Vine Neighborhood has suggested mounting the mural on the side of their building on the brick space between the front corner and the first window. Details are needed with regard to how the mural is to be mounted and how the sides are to be masked so rain or animals don't cause damage. The mural will be 15'x 7' or 8' tall.

Mr. Snyder inquired as to why this mural is not being painted on the brick as most other murals are. Ms. Ferraro advised that the brick wall has never been painted and the intention is to keep it in its original condition. Discussion followed with regard to how the mural could be fastened to the wall and concern was expressed with regard to the fasteners and the brick deteriorating. Ms. Ferraro advised that if the sign were properly enclosed, deterioration should not be an issue. Mr. Nave suggested fastening the sign to the mortar rather than the brick.

Mr. Snyder inquired as to why the mural needed to be placed on a wall that's in perfect condition. Ms. Ferraro stated that the wall is highly visible and it is a mural about the neighborhood that the kids have designed and painted themselves. The mural cannot be free standing against the wall because of concerns regarding vandalism. It is to be placed toward the top of the wall so it won't be as vulnerable to vandalism. Mr. Snyder suggested hanging the mural from the top down like a large, framed piece and then it would only need to be secured in one or two locations. Concern was expressed that the sign should not swing in the wind or be susceptible to vandalism. The sign will be temporary since the intention is for it to only be there a few years. Mr. Nave suggested lining up the mural with the top of the storefront.

Ms. Ferraro stated that she could work with the applicant and provide more details at the next HDC meeting. Mr. Snyder stated that he was amenable to the idea of having a mural provided there is some sort of support other than the brick and the attachment at the building is minimized.

Discussion followed with regard to the possibility of putting the mural on the building next door where the wall is already painted. Ms. Ferraro pointed out that there are no parking spaces in front of the wall next door so the visibility might be higher there than at 511 W. Vine. Ms. Poole-Woldring stated that the kids have already begun painting the mural on wood. The urgency at this point is that an August 27th unveiling of the mural has been planned for the 25th anniversary of the Vine Neighborhood Assoc. Ms. Ferraro stated that she would speak with Suzie at the Vine Neighborhood Assoc. and come to the August meeting with details. The general consensus of the HDC was to consider other options or have the applicant come back to the HDC with a proposal to minimize damage to the building at 511 W. Vine. Mr. Oudsema suggested that the north side of Bill's Lock Shop would also be a good place to attach the mural.

MINUTES (June 21, 2005)

Minutes from the June meeting were e-mailed to the HDC members after the packet went out. Most of the commissioners did not have a chance to read the minutes before the July meeting so it was decided to postpone approval of the June minutes until the August meeting.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. Poole-Woldring, moved to defer approval of the June 21 Historic District Commission minutes until the next meeting. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

733 Axtell

Ms. Ferraro advised that 733 Axtell was purchased by someone who intends to repair it and maintain it as a single-family residence.

530 W. South Street

Mr. Snyder requested an update on this property. Ms. Ferraro advised that the owners of the property informed her they didn't receive the letter she sent after the April meeting with regard to the eastern boundary of the property. They did receive the violation letter stating that the south wall and iron fence was too tall. Ms. Ferraro advised that the owners thought they had permission to go to the full height they wanted on the wall and that she is resending them the letter stating that they do not have permission to go to that height. Mr. Snyder questioned if the owners even had permission to move forward. Ms.

Ferraro stated that the owners had permission to proceed on the east wall but not until they met with Ms. Ferraro and Mr. Nave. She stated that the owners never got back with her about setting up the date to meet and discuss the details of the wall and they are out of town until September. Ms. Ferraro advised that there is a stop work order on the project and the project cannot proceed until the order is lifted. The owners advised that they lost their contractor because of the delay. Ms. Ferraro advised that she left the owners a carbon copy of her notes stating that 72" is the highest the Historic District Commission would consider on the south wall and the wall is currently 93". Ms. Ferraro stated that the minutes of the last meeting pertained to an amendment that only dealt with the east wall; nothing was changed with regard to HDC's prior decision on the south wall. The south wall was approved two years ago. Mr. Snyder requested that last month's minutes be included in the August packet.

432 Ranney

Ms. Poole-Woldring requested an update on this property. Ms. Ferraro stated that there was discussion of the demolition permit being issued 7-19-05. Ms. Poole-Woldring expressed concern with regard to time limits and Ms. Ferraro responded that the Notice to Proceed, which allows demolition was good for six months so there is plenty of time.

Other Business

Mr. Nave mentioned the restoration of the building where Bell's Beer is located and discussion followed with regard to the details of the project.

Mr. Oudsema inquired if the 100 block of E. Michigan, just east of the Kalamazoo mall, is in the historic district. Ms. Ferraro advised that area has been declared eligible but the owners refused the designation. Mr. Nave expressed concern about the proposed demolition of four of the oldest buildings on Michigan Ave. and discussion followed with regard to possible solutions. Ms. Ferraro advised that the Historic Preservation Commission has written several letters about that issue and the Pfizer tower. Mr. Snyder mentioned an article written by Peter Green alleging that the City never informed Pfizer regarding the 30-day stay of demolition. She further stated that Pfizer is reevaluating their research and development internationally so the demolition is on hold for now.

1007 S. Westnedge

Mr. Decker mentioned that the ramp was installed at this location after it was denied by the HDC. The applicant for this property requested that a ramp be installed for use by the 18-year old handicapped resident. The applicant failed to appear at the HDC meeting to provide details of the project and the request was denied for lack of information. Mr. Snyder stated that the applicant should not have proceeded with construction of the ramp under these circumstances and they should be sent a violation notice.

Mr. Oudsema mentioned that the historic district is a voluntary system and that some property owners choose to ignore what they have been directed to do. Discussion

Historic District Commission Minutes

July 19, 2005

Page 13 of 14

followed with regard to possible recourse for this violation. Mr. Snyder suggested that the applicant either come before the HDC to ask for retroactive approval or that they take down the ramp. He also mentioned that, according to ordinance, this is not a voluntary system and the Historic District Commission has legislative authority. Further discussion followed with regard to possible remedies for this situation. Reference was made to another property with a ramp; the owner had promised that the ramp would be removed when the tenant moved out. The tenant is out but the ramp is still there. Mr. Snyder expressed concern that ignoring these situations could set a dangerous precedent and he urged the HDC to enforce the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines. Ms. Ferraro advised that she would write a violation letter for the 1007 S. Westnedge property and urge the applicant to appear in front of the Historic District Commission for further discussion.

Mr. Snyder mentioned that he thought the HDC had an agreement with the city's housing department that a property owner could not obtain a Rental Registration or Certificate of Occupancy if there were historic violations. Ms. Ferraro stated that the property was already certified and will not be up for review until about a year and half. Inspector Smith added that the housing department does not officially delay Certificates of Compliance because there are historic violations. She stated that she has done so in the past but that other inspectors who work in the historic district have not been advised of this rule. Mr. Snyder urged that this information be disseminated to inspectors dealing with the historic district. Ms. Ferraro suggested speaking with Debra Miller, the Housing Inspections Supervisor, with regard to this matter.

Mr. Snyder stated that the applicant at 820 West Lovell had put the door back in place but not the transom, and either the two 2 x 4's need to be faced with something or what was there originally needs to be put back.

Mr. Snyder requested that Ms. Ferraro follow up with the following issues: the ramp to be removed when the tenant vacated; the door and wheelchair issue at 1007 S. Westnedge.

Ms. Ferraro advised that other southern Michigan Historic Preservation coordinators might be attending the August HDC meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Poole-Woldring, supported by Mr. Nave, moved to adjourn the July 19, 2005 Historic District Commission meeting. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Submitted by: _____
(Recording Secretary)

Date: _____

Reviewed by: _____
(Historic Preservation Coordinator)

Date: _____

Approved by: _____
(Chair, Historic District Commission)

Date: _____