

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes
October 18, 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 5:05 p.m.

AGENDA (October 18, 2005)

Ms. Ferraro advised that 214-24 S. Kalamazoo Mall has been withdrawn from the agenda.

The agenda was approved unanimously by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

DISCLAIMER

Ms. Ferraro read the disclaimer into the record.

OLD BUSINESS

Since there were no applicants present, discussion followed with regard to the details of the 214-24 S. Kalamazoo Mall project. Ms. Ferraro advised that the applicants were planning to start the project on November 15.

Mr. Snyder advised that the HDC stills needs details regarding the windows and cornices. Ms. Ferraro stated that there will be a smaller, simplified cornice on the side of the building. She advised that the curlicue detail on the building could be reproduced. Discussion followed with regard to the cornice. Ms. Ferraro advised that the cornice would be as close as possible to the one at 123 East Michigan Avenue.

1450 Prospect (IHA 05-0175)

Corey Bartosiak was present to discuss the application on behalf of David P. Taylor. The application requests demolition of the existing garage and building of a new two bay garage.

Mr. Bartosiak stated that the owner would like to demolish the existing single-car garage and build a two-stall garage similar to the garage the neighbors have next door. Mr. Bartosiak advised that the breezeway will remain but he intends to remove everything to the right of the breezeway. The siding will be cedar with possibly a bluish paint. The garage roof will match the house, which means that the pitch of the roof will be changed so that the gable will face the neighbor's house. (Front gable changed to end gable)

Mr. Decker inquired if the applicant would be tearing down the small storage building to the east and Mr. Bartosiak stated that someone might be taking that building.

Mr. Nave and Mr. Snyder commented that there doesn't appear to be anything wrong with the existing garage. Mr. Oudsema stated that there is nothing economical about having a 1-car garage. Mr. Snyder expressed concern with regard to re-sloping the roof. Discussion followed with regard to the historical value of the garage and breezeway and Ms. Ferraro stated that the house was built around 1924/25. Mr. Tribu inquired as to why the gable needs to be changed and the applicant advised that the homeowner requested the change.

Discussion continued with regard to the details of the request. Mr. Snyder advised that a decision should be made with regard to the demolition prior to other details being discussed. He added that since the building is over 50 years old there is no reason to justify the demolition.

Mr. Oudsema suggested that economic hardship might be a reason for the demolition. Mr. Snyder stated that this situation does not fall under the definition of economic hardship and that he would be voting against the demolition. Mr. Oudsema commented that to deny the demolition would be to win the battle but lose the war. Ms. Ferraro mentioned that most of the properties in the neighborhood have two-garages and Mr. Snyder commented that the decision cannot be based on what the neighboring properties have.

Ms. Poole-Woldring, supported by Mr. Nave, moved to deny the demolition of the garage at 1450 Prospect based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #3.

Discussion continued with regard to the possibility of demolition and the constructing of a new garage if the demolition is allowed. Mr. Decker suggested the possibility of remodeling the existing garage. Ms. Snyder commented that the demolition must be dealt with before plans for another structure are discussed.

Ayes: Nave, DeYoung, Poole-Woldring, Snyder

Nays: Decker, Oudsema, Tribu

There was some confusion with regard to the wording of the motion and Mr. Snyder suggested a recount. He advised the commissioners that, if they are opposed to the demolition, they need to vote "yes" on the motion, and if they are in favor of the possibility of the demolition they need to vote "no." Mr. Snyder requested another roll call vote on the motion.

Ayes: Nave, Poole-Woldring, Snyder

Nays: Decker, DeYoung, Oudsema, Tribu

Discussion followed with regard to the possibility of another motion.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Decker, moved to allow the demolition of the existing garage at 1450 Prospect subject to the HDC's approval of a design of a new two-car garage. Approval of the design is to take place prior to the demolition of the existing garage.

Mr. Snyder cautioned against such a motion and asserted that approving the demolition of a historic building is contrary to what the HDC stands for.

Mr. Nave suggested pursuing Mr. Decker's idea of remodeling/adding on to the existing garage. Mr. Snyder inquired if there would be enough room for an addition and the applicant advised that it would be possible to construct an addition. Mr. Decker advised that he seconded the motion with the intention that the applicant would present a plan for remodeling the garage before demolition was considered. Mr. Snyder requested that the recording secretary read the motion. He then stated that the motion was not for renovation but for demolition. Mr. Tribu advised that it would be necessary to remove the entire roof, which would alter the historic character of the garage. Remodeling would also require a substantial monetary investment. Mr. Snyder reminded the commissioners that a "yes" vote is in favor of demolition and a "no" vote is in opposition of the demolition.

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

Ayes: Decker, DeYoung, Oudsema, Tribu

Nays: Nave, Poole-Woldring, Snyder

Mr. Snyder advised the applicant that the motion passed and the owner is charged with returning to the HDC with a proposal for the new garage if he wants to proceed with the demolition of the existing garage. The doors would have to be square, the gable end of the roof would still have to face the street and the trim would have to match. Details on all aspects of the proposed new garage will need to be presented to the HDC for approval. Mr. Nave suggested that the new garage either relate to the house or a garage from the 1920's. Ms. Ferraro advised that she could provide the applicant with pictures from old housing catalogs and that would show details that might be incorporated into the new design.

628 S. Park (Case #: IHV 05-0023)

Shaun Willis and Michael Willis were present to discuss the application. The application requests retroactive approval of the front porch redecking, the new rails on the barrier free ramp and the new expanded rear deck (SW corner).

Mr. Snyder inquired as to why the work had been done without a permit and what the applicant intended to do about the violation. He referred to a letter from the Historic Preservation Coordinator, which Ms. Ferraro read into the record. Ms. Ferraro advised that changes to the front steps were approved in 1998 and the barrier-free ramp was approved in 1998 but the approved changes were never made.

Shaun Willis stated that his builder, Mr. Pulver spoke with Lee Larson, City of Kalamazoo Building inspector and that Mr. Willis never saw the permit. Mr. Willis stated that Mr. Larson had advised that maintenance was not included within the scope of the HDC's authority so the applicant could proceed with the repairs. Mr. Snyder commented that any construction in the historic district, other than replacement in kind, would require a permit. As an example, Ms. Ferraro advised that spindles replaced in kind would not require a permit but in this instance, the whole rail is different and that would require a permit. The applicants advised that they have spent \$75,000 on repairs to both houses (Park St. and Dutton) and that they don't have money to redo what has already been done.

Michael Willis spoke of the remedies proposed by the Historic Preservation Coordinator. He advised that they are new to the historic district and problems arose as a result. Michael Willis further advised that Inspector Larson had given the contractor the wrong information. He stated that he was not aware that the HDC rules on paint colors. Ms. Ferraro stated that the HDC doesn't rule on paint colors but the exterior surfaces need to be painted (no stain) except the ceiling.

Michael Willis mentioned that the coordinator advised using Douglas Fir instead of Cedar and that he couldn't find that language in the standards. Ms. Ferraro stated that the new lumber on the porch is wide lumber and the boards need to be 1 x 3 or 1 x 4 width and perpendicular to the house, rather than parallel to the front of the house as they currently are. The HDC normally requires that the decking be straight grain or vertical grain Douglas Fir, tongue and groove flooring. Mr. Snyder added that it's acceptable to use Cedar but the size and direction of the new boards is inappropriate. The boards need to be perpendicular to the house for drainage. Michael Willis advised that the standards don't mention which side of the house the boards should slant away from. Ms. Ferraro stated that the boards must be perpendicular to the width of the house. That isn't specified in writing but the standards are based on tradition and the flooring has always been perpendicular to the width of the house. Shaun Willis advised that the flooring is perpendicular to the walls on the front and back of the house.

Mr. Oudsema commended the applicants for the work they were doing and inquired if they understood they were buying a house in the historic district. The applicants answered in the affirmative. Mr. Oudsema advised that a lot of the problems could have been avoided if the applicants had dealt with the HDC before proceeding with the changes. Mr. Oudsema further mentioned that there is a problem with having the illuminated sign on the second floor of the house. Michael Willis advised that it was not their intention to break the rules. He stated that the applicants hired a construction company who talked with the city building inspector who advised that it was not necessary to go to the HDC for maintenance issues. Michael Willis advised that the applicants have another sign on Park Street for which a permit was pulled through Sign-A-Rama, and they received no objections to that sign. Accordingly, the next sign also went up after Sign-A-Rama pulled the sign permit, and the applicants didn't realize they had to speak with the HDC about the sign. Michael Willis indicated that he had trusted the information provided to him by third parties however, due to the problems that arose, he has looked at the rules and will comply. Mr. Oudsema stated that he was pleased with the substantial improvements made to the properties by the current owners but that he was not happy about the sign on the second floor of the house. Michael Willis advised that the applicants intend to go through the proper protocol to apply for a permit for that sign.

Mr. Snyder inquired if there was any willingness on the part of the applicants to redress the situation with the decking. He added that the HDC has never approved decking as installed at this property; it is inappropriate on the front and back porch. The material on the deck of the barrier free ramp on the north side is acceptable. Mr. Snyder inquired if the applicants would reconsider. The applicants engaged in a brief discussion adjacent to the podium. Michael Willis advised that it was not their intention to circumvent the HDC and that they had relied on what Mr. Larsen said. He further commented that the HDC was asking the applicants to rip up the boards and the applicants think that it isn't necessary.

Mr. Snyder pointed out that the work was done without a permit when a permit was required. Information from third parties may have been inaccurate, but the process was circumvented. If the changes to the property had been reviewed through the proper channels, the applicants would not have received permission to proceed with the changes as completed.

Ms. Ferraro suggested putting the appropriate decking over what is already there. Discussion followed with regard to maintenance of the deck. Shaun Willis advised that the original, framing is still intact beneath the new decking.

Ms. Poole-Woldring, supported by Mr. Nave, moved to deny the work that has been done on the front, northeast porch and the rear southwest porch and the barrier free ramp located on the north side of the house at 628 S. Park St. based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation numbers 2 and 6 and the fact that no permits were issued for the work. The work is to be corrected according to the guidelines and plans for correcting the work are to be submitted within 90 days of the October 18 HDC meeting.

Shaun Willis stated that he would like to exclude Ms. Poole-Woldring from any motion based on her prior call to his law office. Ms. Poole-Woldring advised that the call pertained to another issue not the one on the agenda. After a brief discussion it was decided that Ms. Poole-Woldring would abstain from making or voting on the motion.

Mr. Oudsema advised that he was making the same motion as stated by Ms. Poole-Woldring and seconded by Mr. Nave. With a roll call vote, the motion carried by a majority vote.

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

Ms. Ferraro advised the applicants that they could appeal the decision.

530 W. South St. (IHA 03-0036)

Larry Fuller and Christine Skandis were present to discuss the details of the project. Final drawings for all details of the brick wall and wrought iron were presented.

Mr. Nave advised that he had created the drawings that were presented. He and Ms. Ferraro were present at the August 1 site visit and took measurements to find the correct dimensions for the wall. Mr. Oudsema inquired if the drawings met the spirit of the discussion and Mr. Nave answered in the affirmative. Mr. Nave added that the drawings represent the applicants' wish to extend the cast iron further west.

Mr. Fuller mentioned that, as an example, the section of fence on the south side doesn't obstruct the view. Discussion followed at the dais with regard to the drawings. Ms.

Skandis mentioned that someone had jumped the fence last night and was in the back yard of the property at 530 W. South St.

Mr. Oudsema moved approval of the drawings as presented.

Mr. Fuller advised that he agreed about taking the wall in section 3 down 2 feet. He inquired if it would be possible to have the wall remain with the condition that it will come down if the property is sold. He added that the applicants and the neighbors want the wall to remain. Mr. Oudsema advised that he was not in favor of that suggestion. Mr. Snyder stated that such an arrangement would require legal expenditures by the city attorney and the applicants' attorney. The applicants advised that they would be willing to do that. Mr. Snyder stated that he would like to see the height of the wall reduced but the HDC has the right to consider other options.

Mr. Tribu inquired if the reason for reducing the height of the wall was so that angle of the house could be viewed. Mr. Snyder advised that it is a privacy issue. Ms. Skandis commented that the wall is up and the applicants would appreciate having the security that the wall provides. She added that the applicants would be willing to do whatever is necessary including taking down the wall when the house is sold. Discussion followed with regard to the history of the application.

Mr. Nave expressed concern that intentions, such as removal of the wall when the property is sold, can be lost in the future. Mr. Oudsema stated that he viewed the drawings by Mr. Nave as a compromise by both parties and advised proceeding with same.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. Poole-Woldring, moved approval of the final drawings of the brick wall and attached wrought iron at 530 W. South St. as detailed in the drawings presented to the HDC dated August 9, 2005. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Discussion followed with regard to the drawings presented by Ms. Skandis. Ms. Skandis advised that the gate will be as drawn by Mr. Nave in the picture. Mr. Snyder advised that the HDC didn't receive that proposal and advised that the gate could be considered separately.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Nave, moved to designate Ms. Ferraro to act on behalf of the Historic District Commission to approve the gate at 530 W. South Street. The gate is not to extend beyond the height of the wrought iron fencing that has already been approved. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

716 McCourtie (Case #: IHA 05-0239)

George Wade was present to discuss the application. The application requests the following repairs to the fire-damaged house: 1. Turn the first floor, east rear enclosed porch into an additional area for the adjacent kitchen; 2. Raise the rear, single-story wing to be two stories; 3. Remove the first floor, west side window behind the exterior staircase; 4. Install vinyl siding.

Ms. Ferraro advised that the rear wing is to be taller to add space upstairs. The house will be cross-shaped instead of T-shaped.

Ms. Snyder inquired as to the outcome of the site visit regarding the siding. Ms. Ferraro advised that the siding has not yet been exposed. Accordingly, siding issues cannot be addressed at this meeting. Mr. Wade advised that he was open to suggestions about the siding; it was exposed in one spot and that looked good. Mr. Wade advised that he would like to proceed with the aluminum siding. Mr. Snyder stated that the HDC would have to know if the aluminum would be approved for the rest of the house before addressing the addition.

Ms. Poole-Woldring inquired if one room was to be added upstairs and Mr. Wade confirmed that it was. He further stated that Inspector Larson advised that the stairway be moved to the rear of the house. The upstairs attic will be extended to the full height of the second story and will become a bedroom. All of the other walls will remain the same. Mr. Decker inquired if Ms. Ferraro was in favor of these suggestions and Ms. Ferraro responded in the affirmative. She stated that this plan will give the applicant more space, allow for repair of the fire damage and move the stair from the side to the rear.

Mr. Nave inquired about the configuration of the new roof in back and Mr. Wade advised that it will be a gable roof. Mr. Nave advised that, if the proposal is approved, the HDC will need details on the windows, trim, fascia, overhang and frieze boards. Discussion followed with regard to the drawings that were provided.

Mr. Wade stated that he would like to install 32" doors. Mr. Snyder commented that the HDC would need to know about those types of changes and that the applicant would have some leeway due to the fire damage.

Mr. Oudsema inquired as to the cost of the project and Mr. Wade estimated that it would cost approximately \$80,000. Ms. Ferraro advised that this price would include the interior repairs.

Mr. Snyder inquired as to when an adequate section of the wood siding could be exposed for the HDC to review. Mr. Wade advised that Ms. Ferraro could look at the siding and take pictures for review by the commission. Mr. Snyder advised that, depending on the

circumstances, the HDC would need to review the condition of the siding. Mr. Wade expressed concern about trying to find wood to match the existing wood and Mr. Snyder advised that it is still available. The HDC would allow certain synthetics under certain conditions. Ms. Ferraro advised that the siding would not have to match perfectly but should be very close to the original. Mr. Oudsema advised that he would prefer that the applicant use wood siding.

Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Tribu, moved approval of the expansion and building at 716 McCourtie with the condition that the following items match the historic guidelines or the original material: trim, siding, doors, storm doors, overhang, fascia, frieze board, roof, drip edge, balcony, stairs, railing, apron and the siding. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

100 Monroe (Case #IHA 05-0244)

Fred Royce was present to discuss the application. The application requests: 1. Signs for the bed and breakfast, and 2. A barrier free ramp to wrap from the front porch around the northwest corner of the house.

Mr. Royce advised that the Zoning Board of Appeals granted the variance last Thursday allowing him to have a sign at the bed and breakfast. Ms. Ferraro read the ZBA motion. After a brief discussion, it was decided that this application should be handled with two motions.

Mr. Nave inquired if there was anything associated with the parking lot that the HDC might be concerned with such as the fencing and lighting, etc. Mr. Snyder advised that he is also on the Zoning Board of Appeals and that the proposal didn't address anything that the HDC would be concerned with.

Mr. Royce stated that he would like to have a rectangular, sandblasted wood sign, which will have raised, cut out lettering and an image of the castle. The sign will be at the corner of W. Main and Monroe. Mr. Royce advised that he is still working on an image for the sign. The plan is to have two posts at each end with the sign in the middle and the sign will be illuminated from below.

Mr. Nave inquired if the variance was for 2 - 24 square foot signs or 2 signs totaling 24 square feet. Ms. Ferraro advised that the variance is for 2 signs not exceeding 24 square feet in area. Mr. Royce stated that he had asked for 2 signs and each sign is to be 24 square feet. Mr. Royce mentioned that the sign on W. Main and Grand is not double sided. Mr. Snyder advised that the Zoning Board of Appeals didn't consider that question and he advised asking Pete Eldridge for an interpretation. Mr. Nave inquired if there was to be a small sign on the back gate and Mr. Royce responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Tribu, moved approval in concept of the signs for the bed and breakfast at 100 Monroe with approval of the final details at a later date.

Mr. Snyder advised that the HDC would want a double-sided sign if it can be viewed from two directions. Ms. Ferraro stated that the sign at Grand and Monroe is single-sided.

Ms. Poole-Woldring advised that Mr. Royce is representing her in another matter and, accordingly, she will be abstaining from the vote.

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

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

Mr. Snyder inquired as to how the applicant selected the proposed ramp. Mr. Royce advised that the ramp would be less disruptive to the building, less expensive and more practical than an elevator.

Ms. Ferraro advised that she and Mr. Royce reviewed several possibilities for the location of the ramp. The objective is to avoid disturbing any of the historic features of the house. Accordingly, Leonard Yonkman came up with the idea for putting the ramp on the front of the house. The ramp will be removable; one stone on the north side of the wing walls flanking the front steps will need to be removed and put back when the ramp is removed. Ms. Ferraro advised that there are no drawings yet and the applicant needs to provide more details.

Mr. Oudsema inquired if it would be possible to install a lift similar to a chair lift for an interior staircase. Ms. Ferraro advised that there is a short flight of steps by the back door that leads to the kitchen but it's not wide enough to accommodate a full chair lift. Mr. Oudsema inquired if the front door would accommodate a wheelchair and Ms. Ferraro confirmed that it would. Mr. Oudsema inquired about having a lift in that location and Mr. Nave stated that the code would not allow such a lift unless it was enclosed. Mr. Royce advised that such a lift would be about \$20,000 and it must be enclosed. Mr. Oudsema inquired as to the cost of the ramp and Mr. Royce advised that he didn't have that information.

Discussion followed with regard to the requirements for the ramp. Mr. Nave advised that the ramp must include a 5' x 5' resting area per code. The handicapped person must be able to enter the front door so there is some question as to whether the ramp can extend around the house. Mr. Royce inquired if how they get to the ramp is an issue and Mr. Nave confirmed that it is. Mr. Nave suggested reviewing this matter with Bob Petrick, the Building Official.

Mr. Oudsema stated that he would be more comfortable if he could see drawings of what the applicant is proposing. He further stated that a lift might be preferable since it would be less obstructive. Mr. Snyder suggested approval in concept for the handicap access since no pictures have been presented at this point.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Decker, moved approval in concept for the application of a handicap access at the front door of 100 Monroe St. Details are to be reviewed by the commission after receiving specific plans and drawings. With a roll call vote, the motion carried by a majority vote.

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

Abstain: Poole-Woldring

814 W. Kalamazoo Ave. (Case #: IHA 05-0244)

Pat O'Brien was present to discuss the application. The application requests a handrail waiver for the front porch steps flanked by brick wing walls.

Mr. Snyder advised that the handrail approval by the HDC is not necessary. Ms. Ferraro advised that this is a rental property and that she felt it would be advisable to have HDC approval. Mr. O'Brien stated that this is a housing request and that the other entrances to the house are used more frequently.

Mr. Nave suggested using a single pipe rail along the edge of the steps or adding a free-standing rail in the middle of the steps. Mr. O'Brien commented that he thought the front of the house would not be as aesthetically pleasing with the handrail and he would prefer to not have a handrail in that location. Mr. Snyder commented that the HDC is opposed to the addition of non-historic features. Mr. O'Brien further advised that he has owned the property over 10 years and there have been no reports of injury pertaining to the front steps.

Discussion followed with regard to delineation between rental vs. owner occupied properties as it relates to issues regarding handrails. Ms. Ferraro referred to handrail waiver #3.

Mr. Tribu, supported by Mr. Oudsema, moved to allow the handrail waiver for the front porch at 814 W. Kalamazoo Ave. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

307/309 Elm (Case #IHA 05-0258)

Dean Starfeldt was present to discuss the application. The application requests installation of a basement egress window on the north side of the house. There are currently no openings in that wall.

Mr. Starfeldt advised that he is working with Matt Musselman to put an egress window in the basement on the north side of the property. There is no light in those rooms and that he would like to have a window for egress and light. Mr. Starfeldt approached the dais with his laptop computer to show the HDC the details of the project. Discussion followed with regard to the easement and Mr. Starfeldt advised that he could come to the property line.

Mr. Oudsema stated that the window openings are bricked up and he inquired as to why the applicant didn't open them up. Mr. Starfeldt advised that it was for safety reasons. He stated that his family used the study/family room in that area and they want the egress window for safety and light. The building is currently being used as a duplex. Mr. ????? advised that he is the owner/occupant of the lower unit and the upper unit is rented out. The previous owner bricked up the original basement windows on the Northside of the house. Mr. Starfeldt stated that he needs approval on the egress and the enclosure.

Mr. Oudsema suggested removing the bricks from the openings and replacing the windows. Mr. Starfeldt stated that he wants the egress window for safety reasons since he uses the basement as a family room. Discussion followed with regard to the options for the egress window. Mr. Snyder stated that the HDC must first consider if they would allow an egress window before considering the details of the window.

Ms. Ferraro commented that, in the past, the HDC has allowed code compliant apartments to have egress windows. Mr. Snyder stated that the charge of the HDC is to encourage the restoration of historic properties. Mr. Tribu mentioned that the window is hidden and the homeowner is trying to make the best use of the space. Ms. Ferraro advised that an egress window could be approved based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #5.

Mr. Oudsema noted that the window openings appear to be fairly wide. He inquired if something could be fashioned on the inside to provide egress from one of the original openings. Mr. Nave suggested designing a 1-hour or 2-hour rated room around the mechanical room to provide fire protection. Mr. Oudsema advised that he would like the applicant to consider options other than the proposed egress window.

Mr. Snyder stated that the applicant would need to withdraw his current application and come back to the HDC with more details if he wanted to pursue another option. Ms. Ferraro advised that the next HDC meeting is November 15 and November 8 is the deadline to submit an application for that meeting. Mr. Starfeldt withdrew his application. Ms. Ferraro advised the applicant that she would be happy to meeting with him to come up with some other options.

707 Locust (IHA 05-0244)

The application requests demolition of the deteriorated garage.

Ms. Ferraro advised that the applicant lived in Chicago and could not attend the meeting. She read a letter from the applicant stating that the garage is dangerous and that he wants to proceed with demolition. Discussion followed with regard to the condition of the garage. Mr. Snyder questioned how the property could have been certified as a rental unit with the garage in this condition.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Nave, moved approval of the demolition of the garage at 707 Locust.

Mr. Snyder advised that he would be voting no on the motion. Ms. Ferraro suggested invoking DBB rules and ordering the garage repaired. Ms. Poole-Woldring commented that, if the garage is demolished, people will start parking cars there. It was suggested that a fence be installed so as to prevent the area from being used as parking. Mr. Snyder referred to another similar case in which an applicant was supposed to put up a fence but neglected to do so.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Nave, moved to amend the motion to state that a 6-foot tall wooden privacy fence, to standards, be installed after the garage is demolished at 707 Locust. With a roll call vote, the motion carried by a majority vote.

Ayes: Fred, Nelson, Bob, James

Nays: Linda, Lisa, Bill

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

Mr. Nave was present to discuss the application. The application requests: 1. Changing the height of the railing on the back porch to 26" (1" taller than the front porch rail) and, 2. Changing the decking to Trex (recycled material made of recycled plastic & wood pulp.)

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. Poole-Woldring, moved approval of the application for 610 W. South St. with regard to moving the height of the handrail to 26". All work to standards. With a roll call vote, the motion carried by a majority vote.

Ayes: Decker, DeYoung, Poole-Woldring, Snyder, Oudsema, Tribu

Abstain: Nave

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Tribu, moved approval for the change of the existing decking to Trex decking at 610 W. South St., or a like substance. Otherwise, all work to standards. The decking is to be installed perpendicular to the door. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

MINUTES

August 16, 2005

Mr. Snyder requested the following changes to the minutes: Page 1, under public comment, add quote marks around “façade-ectomy.” Page 2, under 530 W. South St., 4th line remove “to” before write. Page 4, under 611 W. South Street, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence, strike “the” after new. Page 4, 3rd paragraph, Mr. Oudsema inquired about the cut stone. Page 4, paragraph, next to last line, 50 over 50 should be 1 over 1. Page 8, next to last paragraph, 2nd line, add quote marks to “façade-ectomy.” Page 10, next to last paragraph, strike the sentence, “further discussion followed at the dais.” Page 12, under other business, the 3rd paragraph, should read, “Mr. Snyder mentioned an apartment building on South Street near Oakland Dr. and stated that the windows have not been properly trimmed out.”

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. Poole-Woldring, moved approval of the August 16, 2005 HDC minutes as amended. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

September 20, 2005

Mr. Snyder requested the following changes to the minutes: Page 4, first paragraph under citizen comments, the last sentence should read, “Mr. Snyder stated that this was not the issue.” Page 5, paragraph 4, 1st sentence, add quote marks to “façade-ectomy.” Page 7, paragraph 4, 2nd sentence, strike “not” before have.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. Poole-Woldring, moved approval of the September 20, 2005 HDC minutes as amended. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Poole-Woldring inquired about the wheelchair ramp at 1007 Westnedge. Ms. Ferraro advised that she was still pursuing the matter and she is setting up a meeting with Kalamazoo County Community Mental Health to let them know that properties in the Historic District need to have review and approval before work is done. Mr. Snyder expressed concern that the situation had not yet been resolved. Ms. Ferraro advised that it would probably take another 2 to 3 weeks for this issue to be resolved. Mr. Snyder suggested that Ms. Ferraro advise the applicant of the potential for involvement by the City Attorney’s office.

Discussion followed with regard to the fact that the HDC must allow the handicap ramp but they can rule on the location of the ramp. Conversation continued with regard to the need for keeping track of decisions made by the HDC and the need for follow up enforcement. Ms. Ferraro advised with regard to the limited amount of time she has to deal with enforcement procedures.

Mr. Snyder requested an update regarding 817 W. South St. Ms. Ferraro stated that she has been in contact with the owner of the property and that she is working on a resolution. Mr. Snyder also requested an update on the handicap ramp at Ms. Orr's property. Ms. Ferraro stated that she had looked through the written records and there was nothing in writing about taking the ramp down after it isn't needed. Discussion followed with regard to the need for a resolution to this matter and a means of enforcing decisions that are made by the HDC. Ms. Ferraro advised that some of the old violations have been rectified and others took place prior to the time she was the Historic Preservation Coordinator. Also, some of the old records are unclear. Ms. Ferraro advised that she is working on resolutions to these matters, and some of the enforcement action may result in referrals to the City Attorney's office.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Prepared by: _____ Dated: _____
(Recording Secretary)

Reviewed by: _____ Dated: _____
(Historic Preservation Coordinator)

Approved by: _____ Dated: _____
(HDC Chair)