

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**Minutes**  
**August 16, 2005**

City Commission Chambers  
2<sup>nd</sup> 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; Maggi Smith,  
Housing Inspector; Amy Thomas, Recording Secretary

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Snyder called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

**AGENDA (August 16, 2005)**

Ms. Ferraro stated that Larry Fuller requested that review of 530 W. South Street be postponed until the October Historic District Commission meeting since the applicants will be out of town for several weeks. The applicants met with Mr. Nave and he prepared drawings of the project. Ms. Skandis is to provide drawings showing how the sidewalk gate will look. Mr. Snyder requested that discussion regarding 530 W. South Street be moved to the end of the agenda.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Christopher Wright from the Historic Preservation Commission was present and expressed concern regarding the proposed “façade-ectomy” of the Gazelle Sports building (214-24 S. Kalamazoo Mall).

**DISCLAIMER**

Ms. Ferraro read the disclaimer into the record.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**832 S. Westnedge (Case #: IHA 05-0123)**

Steve Senesi was present to discuss the final details on the proposed changes to Martini's restaurant.

Mr. Senesi provided revised drawings of the building elevations showing the details of the brackets on the overhang. The commission discussed the updated details of the project.

Ms. Ferraro reviewed the questions/answers from the last meeting: 1. The air-handling units will be located on both roofs but toward the rear as much as possible; 2. There was a question regarding the appearance of the posts on the rear, exterior staircase. Mr. Senesi advised that the posts will be 6" x 6" and the railing will conform to historic district standards, similar to what was installed at Academy Hall. 3. There will be straight, vertical, metal siding on the north firewall.

Ms. Ferraro advised that consideration is now being given to putting the mural on the wall by the parking lot since it would be much more visible in that location. Mr. Senesi advised that, if the mural is applied in that location, the metal siding would terminate above the location of the mural, which would be painted on the concrete existing on the rear wall.

**Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. Poole-Woldring, moved approval of the final plans and specifications provided for the proposed project at 832 S. Westnedge Ave. With a roll call vote, the motion carried by a majority vote.**

**Ayes: Decker, DeYoung, Poole-Woldring, Snyder, Oudsema, Tribu**  
**Abstain: Nave**

Mr. Nave is the architect on the project and, therefore, abstained from voting on the motion.

The applicants for 1216 Merrill, 611 W. South Street and 214-24 S. Kalamazoo Mall had not arrived yet and discussion followed with regard to 530 W. South Street.

**530 W. South Street (Case #: IHA 03-0036)**

This matter first appeared on the Historic District Commission agenda in 2003. It was suggested that legal action might be necessary in order to resolve this situation, since the applicants have not appeared for several of the meetings that were scheduled on the HDC agenda. Ms. Ferraro advised that she has already issued a violation notice. She

suggested having the City Attorney write a letter to the applicants advising that they need to finish the project or incur legal action.

Mr. Nave advised that he attended the site visit with Ms. Ferraro and the applicant. Mr. Nave stated that immediately after the site visit meeting he made drawings showing the current status of the project. The west elevation of the east wall was measured and drawn by Mr. Nave. There was a discussion at the site visit about leaving the 1<sup>st</sup> bay and dropping the 2<sup>nd</sup> column down slightly. There was also discussion at the site visit about having the second bay dropped by 10 courses. Ms. Ferraro pointed out during the site visit that one of the major problems with this project is that the coordinator never received drawings of the entire project as it was envisioned by the applicant.

Mr. Nave advised that the 3<sup>rd</sup> bay has the fence applied to the top of it and the top of that fence lines up with the fence that is currently on South Street. Accordingly, the line continues toward the back and drops two more columns to the top of the fence (column 3 and column 4). Ms. Ferraro advised that, essentially, the top of the iron fence would be the same around both the South Street side and the east side of the property. They might eventually continue that line around the wall on the west side as far as the column and the short wall that comes up to the house.

Mr. Nave questioned if the applicants ever spoke with the HDC about extending the fence down the south wall (the original wall). Mr. Snyder confirmed that the applicants did discuss that with the HDC. Mr. Nave stated that he drew the north (inside) elevation of the south property line. The drawing shows the fence at the same height they have now going all the way down to the next house to the west.

Mr. Oudsema inquired if the applicants agreed to the details in the drawings by Mr. Nave and Mr. Nave stated that they had not. Mr. Nave commented that it was the applicants' idea to extend the fence as shown on the drawings.

Ms. Poole-Woldring inquired if the brick would be the variable and the wrought iron on top would remain the same; Mr. Nave responded in the affirmative. Mr. Nave stated that, as he understood the situation, the only question remaining was the original height of the wall/fence that was agreed upon for the iron facing South Street. Mr. Oudsema commented that the wall is already higher than what was agreed upon but it is already installed.

Ms. Ferraro mentioned that one of the misunderstandings that could have been clarified if the applicant had submitted a complete set of drawing and obtained a building permit, is the substantial difference between the measurement on the inside of the wall and the outside of the wall. There is approximately a 3 to 4 inch difference in the wall because of the yard. Mr. Nave commented that he made the drawings from inside the wall.

Mr. Oudsema inquired as to the current status of the project. Ms. Ferraro advised that there is a stop work order on the project and the work cannot proceed on the project until the order is lifted. Mr. Oudsema pointed out that the work may not be finished this year depending on how the weather is after the October 18 HDC meeting.

Mr. Nave stated that the applicants had contacted him on the afternoon of August 16 to suggest that the fence in the second bay be raised back to the height that the wall used to be. Mr. Snyder stated that he didn't think it was necessary to revisit this issue since it had already been discussed and the applicants had agreed to the lower height.

Mr. Oudsema suggested continuing the discussion when the applicants were present to participate. The commissioners thanked Mr. Nave for his work on the drawings.

**611 W. South Street (Case #: IHA 05-0135)**

Joe Hosner was present to discuss the application. The application requests that a new back entry be built to create a mudroom and basement entry approximately in the center of the back wall. The application also requests the addition of a paved patio with wall/backless benches and possibly an outdoor fireplace to the west of the new entry.

Mr. Hosner presented drawings and provided details of the proposed project. Mr. Hosner mentioned that he was not able to attend the previous meeting but was advised that the Historic District Commission needed more details. He stated that he would be using the same exterior cladding materials as on the rest of the house.

Mr. Oudsema inquired if the applicant would be using cut stone for the foundation and the walls of the patio. Mr. Hosner stated that he would look into using cut stone. Mr. Hosner stated that he was looking for HDC approval before proceeding with a cost estimate.

Mr. Snyder inquired if the applicant would be installing oriel windows in the back structure to match the remainder of the windows in the rear of the house. Mr. Hosner stated that all of the windows in the back are new. He advised that the upper porch and lower porch would match each other and it will match the kitchen on the right side of the house, which has equal sized sash windows. If you look at the house from the back, the addition will match either the right side or the left side. Mr. Hosner advised that he was replacing the 1 over 1 windows, not the oriels. Discussion followed with regard to the type of windows in the rest of the house.

Mr. Hosner advised that he wanted to extend the windows out to fill the space. Mr. Snyder advised the applicant not have the windows configured in such a manner. Mr. Hosner stated that the view from the kitchen would look out over a half wall and through those windows into the yard. Mr. Snyder advised that the HDC is concerned about the outside of the house only.

Mr. Nave inquired about the slope of the roof on the new entry. Mr. Hosner stated that the slope will mesh in with the existing roof and be one slope over the kitchen and the back vestibule. The triangle created under the shed roof by the back extension will be filled with stucco. Mr. Nave suggested using matching wooden clapboard siding in that area. Ms. Ferraro concurred and stated that additions at the rear of older houses tended to be utilitarian. Mr. Hosner mentioned that siding would be less expensive and that he would look into it.

Mr. Nave inquired about the type of door to be used. Mr. Hosner advised that there would be three steps down to the patio where there will be a regular door with a window in it. Mr. Hosner stated that when he bought the house, the original door was missing and that he bought the door that is currently there. He added that he has another door at the Heritage Company that he plans to install in that location.

Mr. Nave inquired if the overhang above the double window on the south end would match the kitchen overhang. Mr. Hosner responded in the affirmative and stated that it will have the rafter tails with gutters. He hopes to replicate the appearance of the front porch and the trim would match the kitchen trim.

Mr. Snyder inquired if the applicant would be using rock-faced limestone on the bolsters by the stairs. Mr. Hosner answered in the affirmative and advised that he had seen some concrete that would replicate the limestone. He stated that he would prefer to use limestone if it is affordable. Mr. Snyder advised that the limestone could be custom made at the Stone Zone in Grand Rapids at a reasonable cost.

**Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Nave, moved approval of the proposed project for 611 W. South Street to include the extension and enclosure of the back stairway and the additional paved patio to the rear of the house, as per the plans submitted by the applicant. The applicant is encouraged to use cut stone if possible.**

Mr. Snyder encouraged the applicant to use oriel windows on the addition. Mr. Tribu inquired if the motion should contain language about the use of stucco vs. siding. After a brief discussion, Mr. Nave requested that the motion be left as is.

**With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

**1216 Merrill (Case #: IHA 05-0067)**

Bruce DeDee was present to discuss the final details on the dormer on the north slope of the roof.

Mr. DeDee advised that he had been to the HDC in May for approval in concept and is now ready to present the final details. Mr. DeDee stated that he would like to install fish scale shingles in the peak. He further stated that he would need help to complete this

project but that he didn't have any help at this time. He mentioned that Ms. Ferraro had suggested holding off until spring. Mr. DeDee advised that he could do the south side of the roof now and the other side next spring. He stated that he wanted the dormer to look like it was original to the house. Mr. Snyder advised that he thought the applicant's proposal was acceptable.

**Ms. Poole-Woldring, supported by Mr. Decker, moved approval of the dormer work at 1216 Merrill as presented. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

**214-24 S. Kalamazoo Mall (Case #: IHA 05-0210)**

Chris Lampen-Crowell from Gazelle Sports and Zookeeper, LLC was present to discuss the change in plans regarding the Gazelle Sports building.

Mr. Crowell advised that the applicants were unable to finance the project as it had been previously approved last year, since they had not been able to establish any financial partnering with other entities or obtain additional grants for the project. Mr. Crowell advised that the applicants want to sell the buildings and lease back the space. The hope is that this would allow the business to grow in the downtown area.

Mr. Oudsema inquired as to the previous appraisals on the residential space. Mr. Crowell advised that the residential component was not a problem but structural issues, problems with the first floor and mechanical costs had escalated the price on the building in terms of renovation. The residential space was appraised at \$816,000 after construction for the five-unit space. An elevator was included in the proposal but there was no parking.

Ms. Poole-Woldring inquired if the applicant was planning on keeping Gazelle Sports in that location and Mr. Crowell answered in the affirmative. He stated that he hoped to have an open floor plan with retail and storage on the first floor consisting of about 7,400 square feet total.

Mr. Nave commented that the appraisal seemed low and Ms. Ferraro advised that it was difficult to obtain financing because lenders had difficulty visualizing what could be created with the space. Mr. Crowell mentioned that he had attended the DDA's recent presentation on a residential study that was completed. He stated that the DDA is the authority on residential urban housing and they have projected what could be in downtown Kalamazoo. There is evidence that the housing market is strong in downtown Kalamazoo and will continue to grow. The problem is that appraising looks backwards and is based on what has happened in downtown Kalamazoo in the past. Rental pricing is not escalating and the sale of buildings is either subsidized or minimized to encourage people to buy old buildings.

Mr. Oudsema gave an example of a third-floor walk-up he sold across the street from the applicant's property. Mr. Crowell stated that the unit Mr. Oudsema mentioned was in the

appraisal he obtained. He stated that the study presented by the DDA showed the need for gap financing for projects in the historic district.

Mr. Crowell stated that he was presenting a conceptual plan and that he needed a decision quickly because he is leasing the space and paying a mortgage on the building across the street.

Steve Hassevoort, Diekema Hamann Architecture, gave the following reasons as to why this project has evolved the way it has over the past year:

1. Inability of the applicants to obtain adequate financing.
2. Need for a larger, open floor plan – experience has shown that the applicant does better with an open floor plan of about 7,400 square feet.
3. The proposed purchaser is Greenleaf Holdings and they want to be in the building long-term. Greenleaf wants to build the space for Gazelle and have residential units and office space upstairs. They want a building that fits the neighborhood and is good for the long-term with minimal maintenance.
4. The space behind the building is a private parking lot and alley for deliveries. If cars park in the lot, a delivery truck can't get through. The owners want to reconfigure the alley space to allow for on-site parking for their tenants.

Mr. Hassevoort provided the following information on the proposed new project:

The front façade is to be restored, along with all three building bays, window repair or replacement, masonry restoration, re-creation of the cornices at the storefront level and at the top. A new structure is to be built behind the façade but will utilize the existing footprint and massing and the existing floor to floor height to match the façade. The building is to be mostly brick on the outside. A concept is being developed for the windows with the suggestion that they be double-hung with size and spacing is to be similar to the existing windows. Mr. Hassevoort provided sketches showing the difference in the footprint of the buildings. Mr. Hassevoort advised that Tom Nehil from Nehil-Sivak, PC was present to answer question about any structural issues with the building and Patty Owens from Greenleaf Holdings was also present to answer questions.

Ms. Ferraro inquired about the structural issues regarding the alley wall where the addition was constructed and the carriage barn. Mr. Nehil stated that the building in the back is a shed constructed of inexpensive brick and sand lime, which is typically an interior infill material. Such material is acceptable when used on an exterior that is not subjected to a lot of water. In this case, it has been used at grade and had been saturated, frozen and damaged. The damage extends up the wall about five feet and there is concern as to how deep the damage is in the wall. There is also damage around the parapets of the building that required reconstruction. Inside there is not much of the structure left: two load-bearing brick walls, slab on grade. There is a patchwork of infill

structures in the building that have been constructed over time. Mr. Nehil advised that there is not much remaining of historic value on the interior of the building.

Mr. Oudsema inquired about the alley being used for parking. Mr. Hassevoort advised that it was a private alley owned by Gilmore Enterprises. Mr. Oudsema stated that Gilmore Enterprises doesn't own the strip of parking behind the Parkstone Building. He added that he developed that building and there is a public alley behind it. Ms. Ferraro advised that she would look into the situation with the alley.

Ms. Ferraro inquired if the applicant was seeking approval in concept. Mr. Hassevoort stated that he was hoping to come back to the HDC at the next meeting with additional details and that he hoped to start this project in the fall.

Mr. Nave inquired if rebuilding was less expensive than restoration and Mr. Hassevoort responded in the affirmative. He further stated that the bids received were 35 to 40 percent over what was expected. Miller Davis was chosen to do the project and they have provided numbers showing the difference between the cost of the old concept and the new one and there is a difference of about \$20 to \$25 per square foot. The new concept is slightly larger plan than the last one; there are seven apartment units instead of 4 and the office space has increased from about 1,400 square feet to about 2,500 square feet. Miller Davis has advised that the new project will be less expensive and the basement will be new.

Mr. Oudsema inquired if the existing façade would be retained and supported and Mr. Hassevoort responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Nave referred to the rendering and inquired about the wall that appears to be down the alley about 25 feet. He commented that it looks a lot like the original wall. Mr. Hassevoort confirmed that it is the original wall. He stated that they hoped to restore the building to the first joint where the brick is a different color. The proposal is to have windows where they have been bricked-up and they will utilize the same window openings as on the original building. Mr. Nave stated that he didn't recall another project of this type in Kalamazoo. Ms. Ferraro mentioned that the Oakland Gym was the only other project similar to the proposal for Gazelle Sports but that the Oakland Gym was not in the historic district.

Mr. Nave expressed concern that the applicant's proposal would set a precedent. Ms. Ferraro stressed the need to consider each case separately. She further commented that the current proposal is the third attempt at rehabbing the buildings at 214-24 S. Kalamazoo Mall; the other two attempts failed. Ms. Ferraro stated that she thought the people involved with the past and current proposals had made every possible effort to redevelop these buildings as they are. She stated that there is not much in the upstairs of the building that is original except the rear staircase and the sink and that salvaging the street façade might be the best way to proceed.

Mr. Nave mentioned that these buildings were included in the National Register historic district to help other projects in the future. He inquired if this building would give up its local historic district status with the proposed project. Ms. Ferraro advised that 214-24 S. Kalamazoo Mall could be included in the National Register Historic District, even if it were a non-contributing structure. It would remain in the local historic district (these two buildings and the building next door) unless a request is made by the HDC or the HPC to have it de-established. Mr. Nave inquired if there was a district across the mall. Ms. Ferraro stated that the entire 200 block of the south Kalamazoo mall would hopefully be in front of the State Historic Preservation Review Board for the National Register next month but it is not on the register at this point. The proposed project for the Gazelle Sports building would not affect the status of the buildings across the street. Mr. Nave inquired if the money saved would come close to the amount of the tax credit. Mr. Hassevoort stated that the tax credit didn't work for this project. He further commented that the gap financing available through the DDA made a difference with the Grace church building that Diekema Hamann now occupies. However, there was no gap financing available for the Gazelle building and the work that was required cost more than the tax credits were worth.

Ms. Poole-Woldring inquired if the façade was the only original part of the building to remain and Ms. Ferraro advised that the façade plus eight feet of the wall down the alley would remain; it wouldn't affect the streetscape.

Chris Wright, Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission, was present to speak about the application on his own behalf. He expressed concern that a "façade-ectomy" had been proposed for the building. Mr. Wright requested that the HDC exercise caution when rendering a decision on this matter as it could be precedent setting.

Mr. Decker requested clarification regarding the comment that there was nothing of historic significance in the building. Ms. Ferraro stated that only the structural walls and openings remain on the interior and the building has been examined carefully over the past decade. She advised that this project is the only candidate for this treatment in the historic district. Mr. Nave stated that he disagreed. He commented on the metal ceiling in the Gazelle space and inquired as to what that space would be like in the future: will it look historic, will it be brick or steel? Mr. Oudsema reminded everyone that the applicant will need to return to the HDC with further details on the project.

Mr. Nave stated that he thought the small shed building in the back should be restored; there are very few buildings like this left in the city. He inquired as to the original use of the structure. Ms. Ferraro stated that she had been unable to determine exactly what the building had been used for, but it was probably a carriage barn/livery stable establishment judging by the style and location of the building. Mr. Nave asserted that the building could be repaired. Mr. Oudsema commented that the carriage barn was not being used in today's market and would not likely be used in the future. He stated his support for the plan that was being presented. Mr. Nave agreed that the proposed project was a good

example of a way to develop a project, however, he indicated that he thought it was not the most appropriate proposal for the historic district.

Mr. Hassevoort mentioned the difficulties that the applicant encountered regarding the shed/carriage barn in the back of the property; it's taking up valuable space that could be used for further development. Mr. Hassevoort commented that he hoped to introduce landscaping and make the area look nicer. The biggest goal is to have parking for the occupants of the building. Also, there are two bearing walls in the middle of the building and it is difficult to work through what to do with that situation.

Mr. Crowell stated that he appreciated the discussion because there is a value to everything downtown. He advised that the economics of the shed are very difficult; he indicated that if the project were approved, they would still not be able to repair the shed. The cost of the project is \$186 per square foot and the shed is about \$270 per square foot so it makes no economic sense to proceed with the repairs. Accordingly, the shed would be neglected and allowed to deteriorate because the repairs are cost prohibitive. Mr. Crowell advised that he had asked Miller Davis to separate repair costs for the shed from the rest of the project in order to determine the feasibility of the project.

Mr. Decker inquired as to how the space inside would look. Mr. Crowell advised that he wanted the interior to look very similar to how it already does: high ceilings and tin, etc. Plans for the interior of the project are in the beginning stages. Mr. Hassevoort added that the intention is to salvage the tin ceiling for reuse.

Mr. Nave referred to the massing in the new plan and suggested looking at the back corner where the shed was; the scale of that corner (the windows and openings, etc.) are almost the same shape as the shed. He inquired if the façade could be reproduced in the corner so it appears as a separate building. Mr. Hassevoort commented that he could work with that but there might be a problem with the height. Discussion followed at the dais. Mr. Nave suggested creating the streetscape along the alley that used to be there and then on the back, west corner create the same alley/streetscape to look like separate buildings.

Mr. Hassevoort indicated that he was concerned about creating a false sense of history. Ms. Ferraro suggested making a few minor changes such as an out-thrust to remind us of the shed building on the new building and rounding the tops of the windows, etc. to echo what's on the shed. This would pay tribute to what was there but not create a false sense of history. Ms. Ferraro suggested that the shed may have also been storage for flammable items stocked by the hardware store.

**Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Decker, moved approval in concept of the proposal for 214-24 S. Kalamazoo Mall per the drawings submitted by the applicant.**

Mr. Snyder stated that this had been a tough decision for him. He commented that he thought the proposed project was not similar to the work done on Western's campus. Mr. Snyder advised that he would vote in favor of the application because the owners have attempted to find solutions acceptable to the Historic District Commission. At some point in time, consideration should be given to the economic viability of the downtown and of Gazelle Sports. The overriding concern is the lack of available financing for the preservation and restoration of the buildings. Accordingly, Mr. Snyder stated that he would be voting in favor of the proposed project.

Discussion followed with regard to the next steps to be followed by the applicant and the possibility of amending the motion to include more of the details discussed. Ms. Ferraro stated that she would incorporate the comments into the approval in concept letter. Mr. Nave commented that the concept involved site plan and most of the comments addressed site plan issues. Mr. Nave inquired as to the effect on the applicant if all of the comments were included in the motion. Mr. Hassevoort stated that he would like to come back to the HDC next month with design development drawings to show more details about the site plan elevations. He stated that he would like to take any input into consideration and discuss it at the next meeting.

Mr. Oudsema mentioned that it would be in the best interest of the applicant to incorporate comments/suggestions from the HDC into their proposal so as to not delay progress on the plan. Mr. Nave stated that he didn't have any amendments to the motion.

Ms. Poole-Woldring commented that she was not in favor of eliminating the carriage barn for parking. She also mentioned the importance of having Gazelle Sports in the downtown area and that it was difficult to hear about the possibility of the carriage barn being neglected.

(6:44 p.m. – Frances Jewell arrived)

**With a roll call vote, the motion carried by a majority vote.**

**Ayes: Decker, DeYoung, Nave, Snyder, Oudsema, Tribu**

**Nayes: Poole-Woldring**

### **Minutes**

#### **June 21, 2005**

Mr. Snyder mentioned that there were two disclaimers and that one should be removed.

**With a voice vote, the minutes from the June 21, 2005 meeting were unanimously approved as amended.**

**July 19, 2005**

Mr. Snyder referred to page 5, the next to the last paragraph, “once” face should be “one” face. The next sentence remove “the” after complete.

**With a voice vote, the minutes from the July 19, 2005 meeting were unanimously approved as amended.**

**Other Business**

Mr. Snyder requested an update regarding the handicap ramp at 1007 S. Westnedge discussed at last month’s meeting. Ms. Ferraro stated that she wrote the letter but hadn’t had time to call the owner about the ramp. Accordingly, the letter has not been sent. Ms. Ferraro advised that she sent a violation letter regarding the issue with the door at 820 W. Lovell St.

Ms. Ferraro stated that the owner of 628 S. Park wanted to be present during the HDC discussion regarding this address. The owner was out of town during the August meeting and Ms. Ferraro advised that she would put 628 S. Park on the September agenda. Mr. Nave mentioned that he observed someone replacing part of the trim on the main house along the street side. Discussion followed as to whether it was replacement in kind. Mr. Snyder mentioned that replacement in kind would be allowed without the approval of the HPC or HDC. Ms. Ferraro stated that she would follow up on that information.

Mr. Snyder mentioned an apartment building on South Street near Oakland Drive and stated that the windows have not been properly trimmed out. Ms. Ferraro stated the address as 817 W. South Street.

Mr. Nave mentioned a house on the northeast corner of Locust and Cedar. He stated that he thought the house should be on the DBB list; it appears that the roof is leaking. Ms. Ferraro advised that that the property on Cedar is owner occupied so the city can’t initiate action on the property. It was suggested that the property could be referred through demolition by neglect. Discussion followed as to whether the property should be dealt with by the HDC or the DBB. Discussion followed with regard to possible funding available to the DBB. Ms. Ferraro stated that she would speak to the owner of the Locust St. property and inquire if she would be interested in applying for a grant through Vine Ventures.

**Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. Poole-Woldring, moved to adjourn the August 16, 2005 Historic District Commission meeting. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_ Dated: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Recording Secretary)

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Dated: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Staff Liaison)

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Dated: \_\_\_\_\_  
(HDC Chair)