

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes
May 19, 2009
DRAFT

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

Members Present: Jay Bonsignore, Chair; Bob Oudsema, Vice Chair; Bob Cinabro;
Linda DeYoung; Nelson Nave; Erin Seaverson; James Tribu

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Bonsignore called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF ABSENCES

None

III. AGENDA (May 19, 2009)

Ms. Ferraro requested that 706 W. Willard be moved to the end of the agenda. The owner will not be present and has asked Ms. Ferraro to present the revised plan. She requested that 228 W. Vine and 716 Minor be added to the agenda. Due to an oversight by her these properties were left off the agenda..

Ms. Seaverson requested an update about the possible noticing procedure for the HDC. Ms. Ferraro stated that there will be a cost for sending out the notices, and that needs to be studied further. A discussion regarding the noticing procedure may be on the June HDC agenda.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Nave, move approval of the May 19, 2009 agenda as amended. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None

V. DISCLAIMER

Ms. Ferraro read the disclaimer into the record.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

909 (737) Village (Case #: IHA 09-0124)

Doug Post was present to represent the property. The application requests the installation of smooth Dutch Lap vinyl siding over a variety of mismatched siding and altered windows and doors.

Mr. Post advised that the City of Kalamazoo shows the address as 737 Village, but there are two separate dwellings on this parcel. Mr. Post was present to discuss 909 Village, which is a detached two-story structure that originally was modified to be a two car garage.

In 2006, Mr. Post came to the HDC to request that the T111, cedar shingles and Permastone (stone veneer) be removed, to be replaced with vinyl siding. At that time, the HDC requested that the existing siding be removed first before a decision was made. The siding has been removed to expose what is underneath. After the siding was removed, Tyvek was installed to keep rain water out of the building.

Mr. Post stated that it is his understanding that, if vinyl siding is allowed, the HDC would prefer a non-glossy, smooth-finish siding. Mr. Post is proposing to use Wolverine Restoration Series smooth siding, either Triple Three or Double Four and a half car siding. There is currently car siding of various widths on the structure.

Mr. Nave indicated that the correct term for the siding is Dutch Lap.

Mr. Post stated when the siding was removed, it became apparent that the structure was originally a smaller building, as evidenced by the roof line. When the addition was built, the contractor used whatever car siding was available. The exposure of the siding ranges from about 2" to 3 ½ ". Some of the siding was installed up-side-down, and some of it is missing. There have been numerous window openings in the building that were covered prior to the time Mr. Post purchased the building.

Mr. Post advised that he researched the National Parks Service, Preservation Brief #8, pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, which speaks to the application of vinyl siding on historic buildings. The Act states that for historic residential buildings, vinyl siding may be an acceptable alternative only if the existing siding is so deteriorated or damaged that it cannot be repaired; the substitute material can be installed without irreversibly damaging or obscuring the architectural features and trim of the building, and the substitute material can match the historic material in size, profile and finish so there is no change to the historic character of the building. In cases of a non-historic artificial siding that has been applied to such a building, which it previously had, the removal of such a siding and the application of vinyl would, in most cases, be an acceptable alternative as long as the aforementioned conditions are met.

Mr. Post advised that there is no sheathing under the existing siding. The siding was applied directly over the stud walls with no tar paper or vapor barrier to stop the water from coming in. Also, the wood has a large number of nails embedded remaining in it from the varied additional siding that had been applied over the years.

Mr. Post considered highlighting the former window openings by creating a hatch bar (X) to make them look like a hay door on a carriage barn, but that would look too cut up. There are no significant architectural features on this building. The doors were metal and windows have been replaced. There is nothing of substance on the gables or eaves.

Mr. Post advised that he found a product that satisfies the National Parks Service recommendations. Wooden Dutch lap siding is available through Westwood Lumber, but the material costs two and a half times as much as vinyl, and the installation will be expensive. This property is a rental, and there is concern regarding the amount of money being spent on improvements. Also, there would be virtually no maintenance with the vinyl siding.

Mr. Tribu expressed concern about the proposed vinyl siding that the J-channel around the window opening will be highly visible. He inquired as to the applicant's plans for trimming or finishing the windows. Mr. Post commented that the vinyl requires a J-channel because it expands and contracts significantly over a period of time. Mr. Tribu advised that there is a trim piece to fit over the opening around the window.

Mr. Nave advised that there used to be a standard stating how the vinyl siding is to be installed, if it is allowed. The standards stated that trim should be installed over the vinyl. The trim becomes the J channel. Mr. Bonsignore advised that there is an alternative to J channel, which is 3 to 3 1/2" wide and has a J channel built into it. It goes around the window to mimic wood trim. Mr. Post stated that he intends to wrap the window with 3 1/2" to 4" trim. He is concerned about not having a pocket for the siding to slip into, and he wants to make sure that it is weather tight.

Mr. Nave suggested using something other than vinyl siding. Mr. Post suggested either the Triple Three or Double Four and a half with a smooth finish. Siding World and Jack's advised that is the only smooth siding they carry. They have cedar or wood grain finish siding. Mr. Nave inquired if the applicant has used cement siding. The cement siding is available with a 20-year warranty for the paint. Mr. Post stated that he doesn't want to have to paint the siding. Mr. Nave suggested a simple board and batten siding, with plywood and 1 x 2's to make it look like an industrial outbuilding or small carriage barn. Mr. Post commented that Mr. Nave's suggestion would be contrary to what the National Parks Service recommended with regard to matching the character of the existing material. The existing material is Dutch Lap. He wants horizontal siding that he doesn't have to paint.

Mr. Nave suggested trimming out the house as is. Mr. Post advised that wouldn't be feasible due to the water penetration issues. Nothing was flashed correctly on the back addition, and there are several places where rot is an issue.

Ms. Seaverson referred to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines #6, which states, "Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of the deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. She advised that it would be better to have wood siding than vinyl siding. Mr. Post commented that the vinyl siding would not diminish the property. He stated that he thought the HDC would embrace the vinyl siding if the existing siding was deteriorated.

Mr. Oudsema inquired if \$9,000 and \$4,000 are the numbers Mr. Post was quoted for wood siding versus vinyl siding. Mr. Post stated that the vinyl siding is \$104 per square, not including the trim. The Dutch Lap siding is \$1.45 per linear foot, which translates to about \$300 per square, which is 2 ½ to 3 times as much as vinyl. That quote was for primed, finger-jointed cedar. Also, the installation labor is significant, and every board has to be cut perfectly. Workers charge approximately \$40.00 per hour to install the siding, and cost is a consideration.

Ms. Ferraro mentioned that if the current siding is to remain, it will act like sheathing.

Mr. Nave advised that there are several options to consider. He mentioned that the original siding on the front of the building is in pretty good shape. He suggested installing new siding on the back addition, which would be acceptable for an addition. The Dutch Lap siding could remain on the original part of the building. Therefore, the applicant would only have a small amount of the Dutch Lap siding, and the back portion of the house could be resided.

Mr. Tribu requested details regarding the water issues. Mr. Post stated that what Mr. Nave suggested would not remedy the water problems. The siding would need to be removed, Tyvek or some other type of moisture barrier would need to be installed and then the siding would have to be reinstalled. Mr. Post advised that he was not willing to do that.

Mr. Nave referred to a house that had a similar problem. The owner was looking at putting a thin coat of foam insulation inside of the siding to create a barrier. The other option was to wrap the Tyvek in and out of the studs. Mr. Post stated that the interior of his building is completely finished inside, and it is occupied.

Mr. Bonsignore advised that Tyvek is an air infiltration barrier; it is permeable to water. Tyvek is not designed to water proof the house, which is what the siding is for. Mr. Post commented that Tyvek repels 98% of water.

Mr. Oudsema referred to another house with mismatched siding that the HDC dealt with in the past. He recalled that the prior discussion at the HDC implied that there was a strong likelihood that the request for vinyl siding would be acted upon favorably if the circumstances turned out as they have. He stated that he would support the applicant, but the project must be done well since it may influence how future decisions are made.

Mr. Post advised that his main concern is protecting against water infiltration around the windows, and that he is willing to use the project with the built in J channel.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. Seaverson, moved approval of the application for 909 Village for the applicant to reside the structure with smooth, Dutch Lap vinyl siding, not to disturb the siding which is currently in place.

Mr. Nave inquired if the proposed vinyl siding is wider than the existing siding. Mr. Post advised that half of the siding on the front half is the same size as the proposed vinyl siding. The other side has a 2" reveal.

Ms. Seaverson advised that she would support the motion since the subject building is a non-contributing structure.

Mr. Tribu commented that since this is an irregular circumstance, and every issue needs to be viewed separately, he would be willing to support the motion.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if Mr. Oudsema would be willing to amend his motion to specify that the trim should be a contrasting color. Mr. Oudsema responded in the affirmative.

The motion was amended to state that the trim to be installed at 909 Village would be a contrasting color. The vinyl siding should be installed according to existing HDC standards.

Mr. Nave expressed a preference for aluminum siding over vinyl siding. Ms. Ferraro commented that aluminum might not be appropriate in this case, because it requires a "break" at the corners. Vinyl would require the corner boards that this building probably had originally. Mr. Bonsignore advised that the existing corner boards could also be used for aluminum siding.

Ms. Seaverson commented that since there will be a change in material, it probably doesn't matter if the applicant uses vinyl or aluminum. Ms. Ferraro suggested amending the motion to indicate that the applicant could use vinyl or aluminum.

The motion was amended to state that the applicant has the option of using vinyl or aluminum siding on the subject structure at 909 Village. With a roll call vote, the motion carried by a majority vote.

Ayes: Oudsema, Tribu, DeYoung, Cinabro, Seaverson

Nays: Nave, Bonsignore,

Mr. Bonsignore advised that he would be voting against the motion. The house is on the street and the vinyl or aluminum siding will be obvious. There are other alternatives that would better meet the standards that the HDC should be supporting. Mr. Nave agreed with Mr. Bonsignore's comments.

937 S. Park (Case #: IHA 09-0197)

Jim Bryant, owner, was present to discuss the application. The application requests demolition of the deteriorated shared garage.

Mr. Bryant advised his main goal is to get the house livable and rented. The back door on the house goes directly to the basement. It also provides access to the first floor apartment. The old, wooden door is rotten and was originally an interior door. Mr. Bryant would like to replace it with a steel door. The steel door would be painted a color that would coordinate with the house, and it would have a modern door knob and deadbolt.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired as to the location of the steel door. Mr. Bryant advised that the steel door is inside the house awaiting installation. He would like to replace the paneled door with the steel door. The original trim would remain on the outside of the door, but the door frame would be replaced.

Discussion followed with regard to the possibility of handling each of the five items on the application separately. Only one of the items is on the agenda. Ms. Ferraro stated that the HDC doesn't rule on issues regarding sidewalks, and she can approve the back porch handrail and the front porch steps administratively. Therefore, the HDC only needs to discuss the requests regarding the door and the garage.

Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Oudsema, moved approval of the request for the proposed steel door at 937 S. Park. The exterior trim is to match the existing trim. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Discussion followed regarding the style of the steel door; the applicant is proposing to use a flat, steel door. Ms. Ferraro stated that steel doors may be allowed on side and rear elevations, but flat doors are not allowed as new replacements. Mr. Bryant advised that the door is on the rear elevation.

Mr. Oudsema commented that there have been more than 200 break-ins this year in the Vine Neighborhood, and security is important. Considering the current economic conditions, there may be an increase in break-ins. Accordingly, he was agreeable with having the steel door installed on the rear elevation.

Ms. Ferraro advised that the steel doors which are normally approved would have an appearance of a five or six-paneled door, or a three paneled door with a window.

Discussion followed with regard to the location of the garage. Mr. Tribu expressed concern that the door can be seen from Burr Oak Street. It wouldn't be appropriate to have a flat door in that location.

The motion was amended to state that an embossed, six-panel, metal door be installed on the rear elevation of 937 S. Park St. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Nave referred to the door in picture #6 in the application. Ms. Ferraro advised that the door in the picture is just to the left (south) of the subject door. That door was installed prior to the house becoming part of the historic district. Mr. Bryant advised that he would prefer that the new steel door not have a window.

Discussion followed with regard to the garage. Mr. Tribu advised that it appears to have been a gable-ended garage, which was converted to a hip roof.

Mr. Nave commented that the opening on Burr Oak was likely created during the 1960's. It is not the original opening and it has been sided over. The original opening was on Park Street. Mr. Bryant advised that the garage is only about 12 feet wide, and is not big enough to park a car in. Ms. Ferraro stated that the siding on the Burr Oak side was a historic district requirement when the Building Blocks program was initiated about 10 years ago. At that time, the HDC requested the Dutch lap siding be installed to improve the appearance of the garage. The applicant advised that his neighbor to the north on Park Street who owns half of the garage would also like to have the garage taken down.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if HDC approval would be for demolition of the half of the garage that is on the subject property. Ms. Ferraro requested that the HDC approve demolition of both sides of the garage. There is a question as to whether one or two demolition permits will be needed. The garage would need to be removed from the tax rolls of both properties, and that process is initiated with a wrecking permit.

Mr. Bryant advised that he spoke with Peter Eldridge who advised that both property owners would have to fill out a permit, but it was likely that only one fee would be charged. Mr. Eldridge advised that it would not be possible to obtain a permit to demolish half of the building.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if any of the HDC members visited the subject property. Ms. DeYoung responded in the affirmative, but advised that she didn't view the garage from Park Street. Ms. Ferraro advised that not much of the garage is visible from Park Street. Mr. Bryant stated that there is only about 8 feet between the houses, and it would not be appropriate to use that area as the main driveway because of the likelihood of cars

hitting the houses on either side of the drive. Mr. Bonsignore stated that the walls of the garage look fairly straight.

Mr. Bonsignore, supported by Mr. Cinabro, moved approval of the request for demolition of the garage at 937 S. Park. The entire garage should be taken down, including the part of the structure that services the adjoining property. The siding is to be recycled if possible. With a roll call vote, the motion carried by a majority vote. Mr. Bonsignore was the only dissenting vote.

Mr. Oudsema commented that this is a dense area, where the houses are close together and green space in that area is an important commodity. Ms. Ferraro advised that the slab can remain but any structure above the slab should be removed.

Mr. Nave commented that, when the garage is removed, it may turn into a shortcut for pedestrian traffic in the area. Mr. Bryant advised that a fence was constructed to prevent that from happening, but people removed parts of the fence and continue to use the area as a pass through. He was doubtful that adding another fence along the property line would prevent further pedestrian traffic. Ms. Ferraro commented that people might also start driving through that area if the garage is removed. Mr. Bryant suggested that posts could be added to deter problems with vehicular traffic.

Ms. Seaverson suggested rephrasing the motion as a notice to proceed since it doesn't meet the requirements for a Certificate of Appropriateness, but it is in such poor condition that it's not worth keeping. Ms. Ferraro advised that any demolition is automatically a Notice to Proceed.

Discussion followed as to the possibility of recycling the Dutch Lap siding from the garage. Ms. Ferraro advised that there is a carriage barn on Locust Street where the Dutch Lap siding could be utilized. Also, the Habitat restore is willing to accept siding that is in good condition. It is difficult to finding that type of siding. She stated that she would include two blank demolition forms in the correspondence she will be mailing to the applicant so that the owner of the neighboring property can also fill out a demolition form.

814 W. South St. (Case #: IHV 09-0198)

The contractor, Kevin Osborne was present to discuss the application. The application requests replacement of nine windows on the upper front apartment, and relocating of the front door to the west/left about one foot.

Mr. Osborne advised that the owner would like to use wood replacement windows. He intends to pull out the existing sashes and install new jambs and sashes; the exterior trim would remain intact. Mr. Osborne is doing a complete remodel on the apartment. The old windows don't stay up by themselves, even after the spring clips were added. The window frame is almost flush with the new walls so there is no room to put stops on the

windows. The old window frames are thicker than the new ones, and they would have to extend out into the room in order to build stops to hold in the sashes.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired as to how that situation would be rectified with the replacement windows. Mr. Osborne advised that the replacement windows would be a standard thickness. They will be custom built with frames to fit in the existing openings.

Ms. Ferraro advised that the existing windows are wood, but there is no evidence of either pins or ropes to hold them up. Either they were well repaired or they have already been replaced once.

Mr. Bonsignore asked to see the sample of the window Mr. Osborne brought. Ms. Ferraro stated that the stile on the existing window sash is 2 5/8" wide. The stile on the proposed replacement window is 1 1/2" wide. The existing frame of the sash is much wider than normal. Mr. Bonsignore inquired if there were provisions in the wall for sash weights, and Ms. Ferraro advised that there is no such evidence, but it may have been removed.

Mr. Osborne confirmed that he would like to replace nine of the windows at this time. There are three units in the house. At this point, only the one bedroom unit on the second floor front is being remodeled, and the applicant wants to replace the windows in that unit. He hopes to restore the other two units in the near future and replace the rest of the windows at that time.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if the existing jambs would be flush with the new wall. Mr. Osborn confirmed that the existing jambs will remain, and they will be cut back so they are flush with the wall. Some of the windows had jamb extension on the inside with the stops on the jambs. Currently, the jambs and the sash are flush, as the new one will be. Most of the windows had a stop built on, and only two of the windows will have to be trimmed to make the jambs flush with the wall.

Ms. Seaverson suggested that the stops could be mounted on a surface parallel with the wall. Mr. Bonsignore commented that the trim could serve as the stop, but that would change the look of the window because the trim would have to extend past the inside of the window. It would not be visible from the exterior.

Ms. Seaverson moved to deny the request for replacement of the windows at 814 W. South St. Replacement of the windows will change the character of what is remaining. The functional problems with the existing windows can be remedied.

The motion died for lack of support.

Mr. Oudsema inquired if the applicant was in urgent need of a decision regarding the windows. Mr. Osborn responded in the affirmative and stated that work on the drywall cannot proceed until the windows are installed. Mr. Oudsema suggested that two or three

members of the HDC could do a site visit and make a decision on behalf of the group. It is difficult to visualize the dilemma that is being described. A site visit might result in the formulation of alternatives that might be more acceptable.

In response to Mr. Tribu's questions, Ms. Ferraro advised that she is uncertain as to whether or not the existing windows are original to the house. They are not in bad shape, but she can't figure out how they stayed open other than with sticks.

Mr. Cinabro questioned the legality of convening members of the HDC to form a sub-quorum to make a decision on behalf of the entire group. He stated that he would be more comfortable empowering the coordinator to make the decision, and allowing members of the HDC to attend the site visit. Ms. Ferraro advised that, in the past, the HDC members attending the site visit would report back to the HDC, and the entire board would make the decision. Mr. Cinabro advised that he didn't have a problem with the group reporting back, but empowering them to make a decision might be in conflict with the Open Meetings Act. Ms. Ferraro suggested empowering her to make the decision with input from the HDC members at the site visit.

Mr. Nave stated that he didn't have a problem with replacement of the existing windows with custom wood windows. In the past, the HDC has rejected stock windows because they didn't fit the existing openings.

Mr. Bonsignore stated that he was in favor of Ms. Seaverson's motion. He referred to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines #2, which states that the historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided. It sounds like the windows are relatively unusual, and possibly unique to this property. Installing new windows would change the character of the property. Also, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines #6 states that deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. It doesn't sound like the severity of the deterioration of these windows requires replacement. According to the standards the HDC is supposed to uphold, this request does not qualify for approval.

Mr. Nave commented that if the windows were capped, the pins could be installed. Ms. Ferraro advised that Pullman counter balance could also be installed above the windows. It might also be possible to rework the two windows that are inset deeply so they are set properly. That might be less expensive than replacing all of the windows.

Mr. Nave suggested adding Italianate trim on the inside to provide room for the stop. Mr. Osborne advised that there will be no trim on the inside. The inside of the house will be a show piece; it has been designed as a spec house. People from all over the country will be invited to see it. It is totally sound proof other than the windows. The company who designed the house wants the work crew to travel the country to build these installations. The exterior of the house will retain its historic appearance, but the inside will be

trimless. The engineer designed it that way as part of the soundproof feature. The owner will live at this address for about one month out of the year.

Ms. Ferraro suggested that a primary window with a storm window should provide soundproofing similar to the double glass. Mr. Nave commented that the primary window and the storm would provide a similar r-value as the double glass.

Ms. Ferraro advised that the chair person can support motions, but cannot make motions.

Ms. Seaverson, supported by Mr. Bonsignore, moved denial of the request for replacement windows at 814 W. South Street based in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines #2 and #6. The existing windows constitute a unique character of the property. The issues with the windows can be remedied without replacing them. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

In response to Mr. Oudsema's question, Ms. Ferraro advised that there are solutions for remedying the problems with the existing windows, which are not in bad condition. Mr. Osborne inquired if someone could make sashes to replace the ones that are missing. Ms. Ferraro advised that the R. J. Raven Co. in Grand Rapids, MI, or Woodsmiths in Oshtemo might be able to make the replacement sashes. Mr. Bonsignore suggested contacting Old Home Rehab in Kalamazoo to do the window repairs.

Mr. Osborne advised that the owner would also like to replace the front door and move it about 12 inches to the left.

Mr. Nave inquired as to what is wrong with the front door. The request to relocate the door is based on the interior problem; Mr. Nave requested more details about the interior configuration. Mr. Osborn advised that the house was converted into three apartments. After entering the front door, you would walk immediately to the left. There is now a wall in that location. When the door is opened, it covers half of the stairs. The neighbors advised that the stairs were added back in the 1960's.

Mr. Nave requested details about the replacement door. Mr. Osborne provided pictures of three doors that are being considered. Mr. Oudsema inquired if the existing door could be used in the new location. Mr. Osborne advised that he would also like to change the swing of the door. It is currently a right-hand swing and he would like to change it to a left-hand swing. Ms. Ferraro advised that the old door could be converted to swing from the opposite side.

Mr. Nave expressed concern regarding the symmetry of the window and door openings. The door is currently under the window on the second floor. The windows on the third floor are not symmetrical. Mr. Osborne advised that if the windows were being replaced, he would look into making the openings symmetrical.

Mr. Bonsignore referred to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines #2. He stated that one of the historic characteristics of the house is that the window openings on the second floor are lined up with penetrations on the first floor. There doesn't seem to be anything wrong with the door, and there doesn't appear to be any reason to move it or change it. Ms. Seaverson concurred with Mr. Bonsignore's comments.

Mr. Nave inquired if both of the proposed replacement doors are wood. Mr. Bonsignore advised that the door in example #1 is Red Oak. Mr. Osborne advised that the doors are also available in mahogany. He referred to the circulation problem with the stair. Ms. Seaverson suggested that there would be no reason to move the door if changing the swing would eliminate the circulation problem. Discussion followed with regard to hiding the holes where the hinges are if the hinges are moved to the other side of the door. Mr. Oudsema commented that Rob Chamberlin could plug the holes so they would not be visible.

Mr. Osborne stated that the door still functions, but it is swelled up from lack of maintenance. Mr. Bonsignore stated that he would be more amenable to replacing the door rather than moving it, if the new door closely matched what is currently there.

Mr. Nave inquired if the existing door has beveled glass. Mr. Osborne advised that it is plexiglass. There is a requirement that the new door have tempered glass.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved denial of the request to move the front door at 814 W. South Street. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved approval of the request to replace the front door at 814 W. South Street. The replacement door and hardware are to be approved by the Historic Preservation Coordinator.

Ms. Seaverson suggested that the old door be saved. Mr. Osborne stated that he would take the door to the Heritage Company. There wasn't much historic material remaining in that apartment, except the banisters, which were taken to the Heritage Company. Ms. Seaverson advised that she was concerned about the door being removed from the house. Ms. Ferraro commented that the HDC has requested in the past that features to be removed should be stored and labeled on site in a dry area so they are available for future use.

The motion was amended to state that features removed from the house should be stored and labeled on site and kept in a dry place. With a roll call vote, the motion carried by a majority vote.

Ayes: Nave, Oudsema, DeYoung, Bonsignore, Cinabro

Nays: Tribu, Seaverson

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if the jamb would also be replaced. Ms. Ferraro advised that a new jamb would have to fit the existing opening and replicate what is there. Mr. Osborne stated that the jamb could be custom made to size. The door appears to be a standard size.

Discussion followed with regard to the details of the door to be installed. Only a new door is to be installed not a pre-hung unit. Ms. Ferraro stated that there is no evidence of etched, stained or leaded glass in the original door. Beveled or frosted glass would be appropriate. Leaded glass was not normally used in doors because it was not stable enough to withstand the opening and closing of the door. She suggested that the original glass may have been frosted with a pattern, such as a bouquet of flowers, etc. However, since there is no proof of what actually existed, it would not be appropriate to install a conjectural material.

228 W. Vine (Case #: IHA 09-0128)

Derick Thomas was present to discuss the application. The application requests removal of the upper porch, and rebuilding of the deteriorated lower porch.

Mr. Thomas advised that he purchased 228 and 224 W. Vine about six months ago. He would like to change the front, double-deck porch back to its original, single, first-story porch.

Mr. Oudsema inquired if Larry Burns was doing the work on the house. Mr. Thomas advised that Mr. Burns is not doing the work, but he wrote the proposal for the work that needs to be done. The applicant will be working with Mr. Burns regarding the changes to the roof. Mr. Thomas is hoping to find a contractor to do the work. Mr. Nave stressed the importance of having the contractor follow historic district standards.

Mr. Bonsignore requested details about the roof. Mr. Thomas stated that he would like to return to the original roof style that was on the house. Mr. Bonsignore pointed out that the roof on the list provided to the HDC is different than what is currently on the house. The list recommends replace/repair 2x6 ceiling rafters. Mr. Thomas confirmed that the rafters will be removed and replaced in a different configuration. He stated that the porch has water damage. Mr. Bonsignore commented that the HDC can't approve the list of recommendations provided, because there is a conflict in the recommendations submitted to last month's meeting (#18 and #22) regarding the roof.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if the second story of the porch is an addition. Ms. Ferraro advised that it was built between 1908 and 1932. On the 1908 Sanborn map, it appears as a one-story porch. On the 1932 Sanborn map, it appears as a two-story porch. It is possible that it was a porch with a deck above it, but with no roof over the upper deck. It appears to have been built as a duplex because of the way it is configured on the inside.

Mr. Nave referenced a Sanborn Fire insurance map provided in the packets. The older map designated the house as “D”, which means dwelling. On the 1932 map, the house is designated as “F”, which means “flat” (apartment). Therefore, the house was converted to apartments. Ms. Ferraro mentioned that the house to the right of the subject property was the VanderSalm house and the barns behind it were part of the VanderSalm celery farm.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if there was any evidence of what the original porch roof looked like. Ms. Ferraro advised that it was probably similar to what is across the street, which is a hip roof. Mr. Nave suggested looking at how the roof can be rebuilt after the second floor porch is removed. The roof should be tucked under the siding with some flashing. Mr. Thomas advised that the structure will remain as a two-unit apartment.

Ms. Seaverson referred to Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines #4, which states, “Changes to a property that have acquired a historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.” Mr. Nave commented that there is also reference in the standards regarding deteriorated material, and there is historic precedence in this case.

Mr. Nave, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved to accept the application regarding 228 W. Vine for removal of the upper porch, and rebuilding of the lower porch with a low-pitch, hip roof. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Discussion followed with regard to the details of the porch roof. The house at 224 W. Vine has a low-pitch, hip roof with a gable over the step, which could be used an example. There is a hinged window, but no door, onto the second floor porch of 228 W. Vine. Ms. Ferraro suggested that the motion could be amended to allow the applicant to have a gable over the steps to match the house next door. The houses were built at the same time by the same owner and they are very similar. The gable on the house next door appears to be original.

Mr. Bonsignore cautioned against creating a false sense of history. Essentially, the second story roof will be dropped down to the first story. Building a gable would be more work, but it would also eliminate the need for a gutter on the porch. There was a brief discussion as to whether it would be better to match the details of the house across the street or the one next door. It was suggested that when the upper porch is removed, Mr. Thomas should contact Ms. Ferraro so she can determine if there is any evidence as to what was originally there. She advised Mr. Thomas that he could apply for a building permit as soon as she provides the written approval for him to proceed.

716 Minor (Case #: IHA 09-0200)

Lynn Stevens was present to discuss the application. The application requests demolition of the deteriorated, non-historic garage.

Ms. Stevens advised that she would like to demolish the garage, which appears to be beyond salvaging. She was visited last August by a woman who grew up in the house. Her family moved into the house in 1950, and her father built the garage around 1960. The Sanborn maps from the early 1930's show the garage at the back of the lot, not where the existing garage is located. Ms. Ferraro advised that the building permit for the garage was issued in 1962.

Ms. Seaverson, supported by Mr. Cinabro, moved approval of the demolition of the garage at 716 Minor. The garage is a non-contributing resource in a deteriorated condition. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

706 W. Willard (Case #: IHA 09-0124)

The applicant was not present, and Ms. Ferraro presented information about the property. The application requests an addition at the rear of the house, per the revised drawings.

Ms. Ferraro referred to the next to last/last page of the drawings (the page without a number). The applicant took Mr. Nave's suggestion with regard to turning the gable on the addition at the rear of the house to be perpendicular. Some of the details in the pictures provided are not totally accurate due to problems with the computer program. The windows in the right of the drawing don't appear to be symmetrical, but they will be symmetrical when installed. The cantilever has been eliminated and a gable roof has been added over the back porch/door. There will be a landing by the door. Mr. Nave suggested adding columns or brackets.

Mr. Nave, supported by Ms. Seaverson, moved approval of the application with the Historic Preservation Coordinator to approve the final drawings regarding 706 W. Willard. With a roll call vote, the motion carried with six ayes and one abstention. Mr. Bonsignore abstained from voting.

MINUTES (April 31, 2009)

Ms. DeYoung requested the following changes: Page 6, next to last paragraph, change the sentence to "any additional screening material." Page 10, in the motion, delete the parenthesis in sun porch. Page 16, paragraph 2, "addressed" should be "address." Last page, last paragraph, line 3, add space before "regarding".

Ms. Seaverson referred to page 6, the next to last paragraph, the planter buckets will be filled with cement, not the posts. Page 4, third paragraph from bottom, the roofing felt was used "inside the house" by a previous owner. (Delete "upstairs" and add "inside the house). Page 18, paragraph 2 of the FYI report, Ms. Ferraro provided the HDC with the preliminary draft of the newsletter. Add "Historic District" before newsletter.

The amended minutes were approved with six ayes and one abstention. Mr. Bonsignore was not present at the April meeting and he abstained from voting.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

A. FYI Report

Ms. Ferraro advised that applications will be accepted in June for the window training workshop. There are 10 spaces in the workshop, which may come down to interview and acceptance process. People will leave the workshop with the lead safe work practice RRP and about \$200 worth of tools.

The July/August issue of This Old House magazine features an article regarding the Vine Neighborhood with accompanying photos by Ms. Ferraro.

Ms. Ferraro is 98% sure that the 100 block of E. Michigan will be restored. Details are being finalized with regard to this project.

The preservation awards will take place on May 20th at 5:30 p.m. at 309 N. Burdick St.

Mr. Oudsema referred to 530 W. South Street, and advised that he is ready to capitulate. He commented that the HDC doesn't have the political will to change the violations at that address. Rather than continue with the current situation, it would be better to have the owners leave the brick in place, install the wrought iron fencing on top of the brick wall, and install the light fixtures. The only thing in dispute is the height of the brick wall. Ms. Ferraro advised that the brick wall was to be lowered and the iron fence was to be installed on top of the wall. She wrote a letter to the property owners but has not received a response from them. The owners continue to pay the fines that have been assessed due to their lack of compliance.

Discussion followed with regard to the possible content of the next letter to be sent to the owners of 530 W. South St. Ms. Ferraro stated that she would draft a letter and put it in next month's packet for review by the HDC. She will also provide a copy of the letter for the City Attorney's office to review. She suggested that the HDC Chair and the City Attorney should both sign the letter.

Mr. Nave advised that each of the four sections was treated differently. Ms. Ferraro stated that she was very specific about each of the bays, which she numbered in the photographs she included in the correspondence to the owners.

Ms. Seaverson stated that she went to the historic district commission training in Grand Rapids last week. There was a discussion regarding postponement extensions, which must have a verdict within 60 days or they are automatically approved. She referred to 609 Elm, which was an item on last month's agenda. The owner was not present to

discuss the five windows he wanted to replace. It is important to make sure the application isn't approved due to a lack of action on the part of the HDC. Ms. Ferraro advised that since the owner was not present, the HDC didn't rule on the application. Mr. Bonsignore stated that, according to the information presented at the workshop, from the time the application is filed, the HDC has 60 days to act. If the HDC doesn't act within that time period, the application is automatically approved. For instance, if the application is postponed for five months with no ruling by the HDC, the application would be automatically approved. The Coordinator or the HDC can have the applicant sign a statement advising that he/she agrees to postpone the application, and the 60-day time period would not be in effect.

Ms. Ferraro suggested that, in light of this new information, it might be advisable to have a motion at the May HDC meeting to deny the window installation at 609 Elm Street. Ms. Ferraro has spoken with the home owner about the windows since the meeting. The owner has cancelled her window order through Sir Home Improvement, and she is seeking a local contractor who can repair and rehabilitate the windows she has and install storm windows.

Mr. Nave, supported by Ms. DeYoung moved to deny the application regarding the windows for 609 Elm.

Mr. Bonsignore advised against making a motion on a property that isn't on the current agenda, since it may be in violation of the Open Meetings Act. The owner hasn't been given an opportunity to represent herself at the May meeting. Ms. Ferraro advised that the letter she sends to the owner after a postponement, states that additional information is needed by a particular date (the application deadline date). The letter also states that if the information is not received within 60 days of the date of the letter, the application will be dropped and the case will be considered closed.

Mr. Bonsignore stated that the information presented at the workshop indicated that the owner doesn't have to do anything after the application is turned in for the approval to be automatic after 60 days. There are two alternatives: 1. The HDC can deny or approve the application, with or without the applicant being present, if the applicant has been notified of the meeting, or 2. The Coordinator can contact the applicant to state that the HDC wants to postpone review of the application, and the applicant would have to agree to the postponement. If they don't agree to the postponement, the HDC would have to act at the next meeting.

Ms. Ferraro advised that if an application is withdrawn, she can send a letter to the applicant advising that the application will be on the next HDC agenda. The applicant could provide written notice that he/she wants to postpone the application. If written notification is not provided from the applicant, the HDC will make a decision with or without the applicant being present at the meeting. Ms. Ferraro will add that language to the text of the letters being sent to the applicants.

Mr. Cinabro suggested having someone at the City Attorney's office review the wording of the letter before it is sent.

Mr. Nave and Ms. DeYoung withdrew the motion regarding 609 Elm St.

Ms. Seaverson inquired as to what would be done regarding the application for 609 Elm St. Ms. Ferraro stated that the application regarding 609 Elm was submitted around April 10th, and she will send a letter to the applicant tomorrow requesting that she withdraw the application, which will terminate the project.

Mr. Bonsignore advised that tree cutting and landscaping can also be regulated by the HDC. According to the information that was presented at the seminar, there is a state law that provides the HDC with that authority. The person leading the workshop would not likely have approved the demolitions that the HDC approved at the May meeting, with the possible exception of the garage at 716 Minor. Also, the vinyl siding would not likely have been allowed. At the very least, the applicants should be receiving Notices to Proceed rather than Certificates of Approval. This applies not only to demolitions, but to vinyl siding as well.

Ms. Ferraro advised that Mr. Post was reading from the Preservation Brief, which is advisory not standards. Mr. Bonsignore commented that the applicant was stating that vinyl siding may be approved. There is nothing that says that is must be approved.

Mr. Nave referred to the HDC authority over streets and sidewalks. The South Street Historic District will be studied in the next year with regard to conversion of South Street to a two-way street. The traffic engineer may try to change that street in a way that could affect the South Street Historic District.

Mr. Bonsignore referred to the proposal from the Langeland Funeral Home. That proposal would have changed the street, the sidewalk location, and the landscaping, etc. It also requested removal of several houses. Ms. Ferraro commented that discussion about trees would require an entirely different level of review by someone who can advise if a tree is healthy or not. Ms. Seaverson stated that the speaker at the seminar advised that the property owner would have to prove their case. Ms. Ferraro advised that the City of Kalamazoo's Historic District ordinance doesn't cover living things, only man made objects. The standards may be revised in the near future and language regarding living things could be added at that point.

Ms. Seaverson advised that information presented at the seminar indicated that denials should be sent by first class mail and possibly by registered mail. Ms. Ferraro stated that she sends the denial letters out by first class mail, which means the letters would be returned to her if they are not delivered to the addressee. She also keeps a copy of the letter in the file. The addresses are generally on the application so it is rare that correspondence would be returned.

Historic District Commission Minutes

May 19, 2009

Page 19 of 19

Ms. Ferraro advised that copies of the Historic District Newsletter are available. Information regarding historic windows from the National Trust for Historic Preservation was added to the most recent newsletter.

Mr. Bonsignore advised that the dessert extravaganza will take place on June 6th at his house at 443 Stuart. Those present were encouraged to bring a dessert, and attend the open house which begins at 7 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cinabro, supported by Mr. Tribu, moved to adjourn the May 19, 2009 meeting of the Historic District Commission. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

Submitted by: _____ Date: _____
(Recording Secretary)

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____
(Staff Liaison)

Approved by: _____ Date: _____
(HDC Chair)