

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes
July 21, 2009
DRAFT

2nd Floor, City Hall
City Commission Chambers
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 5:00 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF ABSENCES

None

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (July 21, 2009)

Ms. Ferraro advised that Brian Spaulding was unable to attend the July HDC meeting. Accordingly, 926 W. Main should be moved to the end of the agenda for discussion. Mr. Oudsema advised that he would speak on behalf of Mr. Spaulding. Ms. Ferraro also requested that 424 Douglas be moved to the end of the agenda for a discussion.

Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Oudsema, moved approval of the July 21, 2009 HDC 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

A. 430 Elm (Case #: IHV 09-0271)

Nelson Nave and Sharon Carlson were present to discuss the application. The application requests a new east porch and a new garage. The work was approved in concept in June of 2008.

Historic District Commission Minutes

July 21, 2009

Page 2 of 14

Ms. Carlson stated that she received approval in concept for the addition of the back porch, the kitchen remodel and structural work. The kitchen project was delayed for a year, but is now underway and the applicant would like to revisit that approval. The site plan which includes plans for the porch and a garage has now been completed and she hopes to implement that next year.

Mr. Nave referred to the site plan. The extension on the house is the kitchen area. The new porch is on the north and extends to the east toward the proposed garage. The porch door will be placed where the window is currently located on the east elevation. The window will be moved next to the door. The existing curb cut from Eleanor Street will be utilized for the new, two-car garage. The setback on the garage will be allowed by the City of Kalamazoo because it parallels the house setback. The garage roof will have a slope similar to the house and porch roof, with dark shingles, trim and drip and horizontal siding.

Ms. Carlson stated that there is evidence showing that there was a door in the location where the proposed window is to be installed. At one time, there was a door and stoop in that location. The porch and screened-in porch will be built to standards, and will have flat trim to match the existing front and back porch and the garage. There will be a solid panel on the bottom and permanent screens. The porch will be open with 6" x 6" Cypress-wrapped columns underneath. The screened porch will be very simple, much like the house. It will have the same overhang and details under the over hang.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired as to how the new construction would be distinguished from the rest of the house. Mr. Nave advised that the new construction will be more modern in appearance. The applicant would like to restore the existing front porch columns to look more like the original, fancier columns. The current ones are "off the shelf." Ms. Carlson stated, according to historic photos, the original columns were similar to those on the Greek Revival house (R. Dexter Walker House) at 628 South Park Street. Mr. Nave stated that the screening and the flat trim will give the new porch a more modern appearance than the original house.

Mr. Tribu mentioned that the fascia and roofline of the addition appear to be lower than the roofline by the kitchen on the north elevation, which helps to set it apart from the original part of the house. Mr. Nave advised that the addition sets inside the corner trim. The access to the area over the porch is through the kitchen. Ms. Carlson mentioned that part of that area is original to the structure; part of it is an add-on, but an exact date has not been determined. There are two very long rooms, one on the first floor, and one on the second floor. The Assessor's office advised that it is not a full second story; it is classified as 1 3/4. Mr. Nave advised that the existing plan shows two sections to the first floor. The side porch and front porch are rickety in their present condition, and the applicants would like to rebuild them in the future.

Mr. Bonsignore suggested separate motions for the porch and the garage.

Mr. Cinabro, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved approval of the proposed porch for 430 Elm as drawn. The proposed porch should be differentiated from the rest of the house per Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines #9. Details are to be approved by the Historic Preservation Coordinator. With a roll call vote, the motion carried with six ayes and one abstention. Mr. Nave abstained from voting.

Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. Seaverson, moved approval of the proposed 2-car garage for 430 Elm as submitted, per Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines #10. The details are to be worked out with the Historic Preservation Coordinator. With a roll call vote, the motion carried with six ayes and one abstention. Mr. Nave abstained from voting.

125 Prairie (Case #: IHV 09-0271)

Eric Staab and Karla Niehus were present to discuss the application. The application requests alteration of a bank of four casement doors to French doors flanked by sidelights at the rear of the house. A deck is to be added next year. This yard is not visible from the public right of way on any side.

Mr. Staab advised that the application requests insertion of French doors, two new stained-glass windows bordering the French doors, and the elimination of an existing door. The existing door opens onto what was previously a three season porch. This is part of a kitchen remodel/expansion. The kitchen will be expanded toward the location of the proposed French doors, through the existing four windows and into the back room. The applicants hope to eventually build a deck, which will be accessed by the French doors. Temporary steps will be added in the back until the deck can be built. Mr. Bonsignore stated that the door cannot remain unless there are steps in that location.

Mr. Nave inquired as to how long "temporary" would be. Mr. Staab advised that the deck would probably be built this fall and the steps would be removed at that time. Mr. Bonsignore suggested setting a time limit for the temporary steps to remain in place.

Mr. Nave mentioned that the French doors were originally interior doors. Mr. Staab stated that the doors are 1 3/4". Peter Carroll advised that the French doors came from a salvage company in Toledo. The doors were originally on the interior or balcony of a house in Toledo, but they are equivalent to the exterior grade that is currently used. Mr. Nave commented that sometimes interior doors deteriorate quickly on the exterior. He inquired if storm doors over the wood doors. Ms. Niehus advised that the French doors already have storm doors over them, which indicates they were already being used on the exterior. They have the original hardware and turn bolts. Each door has a storm window that is trimmed with metal that is held into the door with wing nuts. The applicants asked Mr. Carroll to remove the glass from the storm doors and build a set of French doors that could have the storms or screens inserted into them.

Mr. Nave suggested putting flashing on the top of the doors. Mr. Staab stated that the current four windows have a drip line off the top. When those doors are dismantled, the wood trim will be salvaged and reused. If the drip line cannot be salvaged, a different one will be installed. Mr. Nave suggested installing a sill and a piece of trim under the sill. Mr. Staab advised that Mr. Carroll is creating the jamb set for the doors and threshold.

Mr. Tribu inquired if the existing window opening would remain as is or if additional stucco would need to be removed. Ms. Niehus stated that the measurements of the salvaged French doors are slightly wider than the two middle casement windows. The stained-glass windows are slightly narrower. Therefore, the overall width will not change and the opening will not be altered.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if the stained glass windows are to be inserted into the existing window frames. Mr. Staab advised that the stained glass may be inserted into the existing window frames or new frames might be installed. The applicants are looking into that.

Mr. Nave, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved approval of the application for installation of the French doors as proposed for the rear of 125 Prairie as presented, with temporary steps to be installed for up to 12 months until the replacement porch is approved.

Ms. Seaverson referred to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines #3, which relates to changes that create a false sense of history. She expressed concern regarding the installation of stained glass windows in the proposed location. Ms. Ferraro suggested mounting the stained glass windows in a frame on the inside. This would allow the applicants to more easily remove them when they sell the property. Also, the stained glass would not be as vulnerable on the inside. Mr. Staab advised that the applicants considered having storm windows in front of the stained glass. Ms. Seaverson advised that she would be voting against the motion as stated.

Mr. Bonsignore explained that a feature added to a historic property should look like an addition, and not like an original feature of the house. Mr. Staab mentioned that the stained glass windows were from the same era as the house. Ms. Ferraro advised that although the stained glass windows would be appropriate for the era, they were not an original feature of the house. Therefore, installing them would create a false sense of history. Ms. Niehus expressed concern that the extra muntins would not look appropriate. Ms. Ferraro suggested using a single piece of glass over the stained glass. There would be no need to install muntins. The cavity in the window frame would be on the inside rather than on the outside like a normal storm window. The stained glass would not be permanently attached to the house so it would not be in conflict with historic standards.

Discussion continued with regard to the best way to install the stained glass windows. Mr. Staab stated that the four windows on the back wall are not original to the house. Mr. Nave felt that it would be acceptable to install the stained glass windows and the French door because they are recycled materials. Ms. Seaverson expressed concern that installation of those materials would be conjectural. Mr. Nave commented that the stained glass windows would be removable. Ms. Ferraro added that the stained glass windows would be installed on the rear elevation, and there is more flexibility with regard to what can be installed in that location.

The motion was amended as follows:

The applicant is to have the option of installing the stained glass windows or the storms on the outside. The exterior trim is to match the original. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

418 Pearl (Case #: IHA 09-0284)

Dean Plichta was present to discuss the application. The application requests demolition of the deteriorated four-bay garage.

Ms. Plichta stated that he would like to demolish the garage due to financial hardship. The roof is gone, and the garage doors are not functional and are not original. Repairs were done by a previous owner before 2002 with OSB and are not to historic standards. There is a tree growing onto the rear of the garage which is around 8" in diameter, which may come down on the garage if someone attempts to remove it. Approximately three years ago, Mr. Plichta was quoted \$9,000 to \$11,000 for repairing the garage. The garage behind the subject property was removed last year, and now the rear is visible. Given the amount of work necessary to repair the garage, it would be better to tear it down. Mr. Plichta plans to install a fence in the back yard after the garage is demolished. Currently, the neighbors use the garage for junk storage and it is a hazard. The city's inspection department has noted that the garage needs to be removed or repaired.

Mr. Nave advised that it would cost about \$60,000 to build a new garage.

Mr. Cinabro commented that a notice of denial was sent to Mr. Plichta in 2004 advising that the garage could be repaired. He inquired as to what happened. Mr. Plichta advised that it was cost prohibitive to repair the garage at the time, and now it is in worse condition. Mr. Cinabro inquired if any effort had been made to repair the garage. Mr. Plichta stated that he got bids for repair of the garage.

Ms. Ferraro stated that in 2004, when this matter was last on the agenda, the space behind this garage and the adjacent garage was only about 2½" feet and filled with vegetation and a collapsing fence. It was impossible at that point to get a clear view of the back wall. It is worse condition than she expected, based on what was visible from the inside.

Ms. Seaverson inquired as to the assessed value of the garage, and Mr. Plichta advised that he didn't know.

Mr. Oudsema inquired if the applicant thought the property would be more functional without the garage. Mr. Plichta responded in the affirmative, and added that he thought repairing the garage would not increase the rate of the rental units. In response to further questions from the Commission, the applicant stated that the house was built in 1910; he has owned the house since 2002. Discussion continued with regard to the age and condition of the garage. Ms. Ferraro stated that the garage has a hollow tile wall that was common during that era, due to paranoia about fire from cars. She estimated that the garage was built between 1910 and the late 1920's.

Mr. Nave commented that the gable facing east was designed to look like the house; the shape and material are similar. Ms. Ferraro advised that there is not much original material left on the garage, so it is difficult to gather any clues from what remains.

Mr. Oudsema moved approval for the demolition of the garage at 418 Pearl Street per the applicant's request.

The motion died for lack of support.

Ms. Seaverson suggested that the applicant may have a case for financial hardship, but he would need to return with more evidence. Mr. Nave advised that if a new garage would cost \$60,000, and the estimate to fix the existing garage was \$9,000 to \$11,000, the garage, as is, may be worth \$45,000.

Mr. Oudsema commented that the applicant owns a substantial number of rental units in the Vine Neighborhood and west of WMU. Mr. Plichta stated that he owns about 130 rental units. Mr. Oudsema continued by stating that Mr. Plichta has a good reputation for taking care of his rentals. He has made a business decision that the garage is not worth investing in. The HDC can deny the demolition, but the garage will continue to deteriorate. If it were financially in the best interest of the applicant to invest in the garage, he would have done so. The money he is not willing to invest in the garage will be invested in the primary structure.

Mr. Bonsignore stated that he had a problem with allowing the demolition because it was denied 5 years ago. Allowing the applicant to proceed with the demolition at this point would undermine HDC authority. Demolition of the garages goes against the historic district standards.

Mr. Oudsema commented that, as a property owner in this neighborhood, he thought it did not serve his or the neighbors' best interest to have garages left in this condition. He estimated that 95% of property owners are not willing to invest in these structures, and as a property owner that doesn't serve his interests.

Historic District Commission Minutes

July 21, 2009

Page 7 of 14

Mr. Nave suggested that the applicant could have invested approximately \$3,000 per year over the last five years to repair the garage. The repairs could have been completed by now and it would no longer be a problem.

Mr. Cinabro commented that he is sympathetic, but concerned about the denial 5 years ago and the fact that no effort has been made to repair the garage. He suggested the possibility of further discussions regarding garage demolitions, off the record, in an effort to better educate the commissioners on this subject. The garage looks terrible and probably should come down. However, there has been no effort to repair it and that is troublesome.

Mr. Oudsema commented that maintenance of a historic property is largely voluntary. The government doesn't have the capacity to force compliance. The reality is that people do not approach the HDC with requests to repair their garages; they ask for demolitions. The HDC can take the stance that the property owner purchased the property, therefore, they have to live with it, but these problems will continue.

Ms. Seaverson stated that the historic fabric should be retained. The decision should be based on the historic district standards. She also expressed concern regarding the notice of denial 5 years ago, and that nothing has been done to repair the garage.

Mr. Plichta informed the HDC that he spent \$7,000 to paint the house and put on a new roof on the front. He chose to invest money in the main building; the garage is not as important. Mr. Plichta stated that he pays over a quarter of a million dollars in property taxes to the City of Kalamazoo.

Ms. Ferraro agreed with Mr. Oudsema, and commented that the HDC will probably see more requests for garage demolitions. This garage was built under different codes than what currently exist. Many of them have been poorly repaired and not taken care of. The HDC can allow demolition per PA169 if one of the following four conditions is met:

1. The resource constitutes a hazard to the safety of the public or the structure's occupants.
2. The resource is a deterrent to a major improvement program.
3. The resource is causing undue financial hardship to the owner when a government action, act of god, or other events beyond the owner's control created the hardship.
4. Retaining the resource is not in the best interest of the community.

There must be a good reason to allow the demolition. Much of the historic material was missing before Mr. Plichta bought the property. Some garages can be repaired such as the one at 734 Village St. that was recently repaired, but some are in profoundly poor condition. The poor condition of the garage was not of the applicant's doing. The tree growing into the back of the garage has probably been there for a decade. This garage is in really rough shape and it may take more money than feasible to get it fixed.

Mr. Bonsignore commented that the garage is in such bad shape because the applicant neglected it the entire time he owned it. Part of the reason it would cost so much now to repair it is due to the lack of maintenance. It is an insult to the HDC for someone to

appear in front of the Commission with a denial from five years ago, and advise that the garage is in worse shape now. Mr. Bonsignore advised that he would vote against tearing this structure down.

Ms. Seaverson, supported by Mr. Cinabro, moved to deny the application for demolition of the garage at 418 Pearl.

Ms. Seaverson advised that if one of the four reasons can be met per PA169, the applicant can return to the HDC with his request. The applicant advised that he could likely provide information to support a case for financial hardship. Mr. Cinabro suggested providing more information about the cost of resolving this issue.

Mr. Plichta inquired if his application could be tabled. Ms. Ferraro suggested postponing the decision until next month. Ms. Seaverson asserted that the application needs to appear on the HDC agenda next month, and a decision needs to be made at that point.

Ms. Seaverson, supported by Mr. Cinabro, moved to postpone the decision regarding the request to demolish the garage at 418 Pearl St. until next month pending evidence regarding financial hardship from the applicant. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tribu suggested that the applicant should provide actual bids for review by the HDC.

Ms. Seaverson commended the applicant for his investment in his other rental properties. However, that doesn't pertain to this property.

Ms. Ferraro stated that she would include information regarding hardship with the letter she will be sending to the applicant.

926 W. Main

The applicant was not present at the meeting. The application requests replacement of the siding on the front of the building only with cement fiber siding.

Mr. Oudsema stated that he initiated the application on this property. He observed the applicant repainting the house, and inquired if he had considered residing it with concrete plank. Mr. Spaulding advised that he might be interested in that option since it would cut down on maintenance. Currently, it doesn't hold paint well, possibly due to the south elevation or a problem with moisture.

Ms. Ferraro stated that the existing trim would remain; only the siding would be replaced. Mr. Bonsignore inquired if there would be mixing and matching of the siding. Ms. Ferraro advised that there would not, since the entire front will be redone.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if insulation has been blown into the walls. Mr. Oudsema advised that he didn't have any details regarding the insulation. Ms. Seaverson suggested that issues with insulation may be causing the moisture problems.

Mr. Tribu stated that he was concerned regarding the installation, since the corners may need to be sealed with caulk. Mr. Bonsignore mentioned that cement fiber siding requires careful caulking in order to perform correctly. Since the cement siding comes in 12 feet lengths so there should be no joints. Ms. Ferraro stated that the applicant requested a decision either to approve or deny and he will continue the repairs either way.

Ms. Seaverson suggested that the wood is not the problem; she suggested that it is a vapor drive issue because of the insulation. If that is the case, replacing the siding isn't going to resolve the issues with the paint. Mr. Bonsignore stated that the siding will make a difference, especially if it is a pre-primed product. The wood absorbs moisture, particularly because it isn't primed on the back and it expands and contracts. The cement fiber doesn't react the same way to the moisture. Ms. Ferraro inquired if cedar siding that is primed on the back would make a substantial difference. Mr. Bonsignore commented that the cement fiber siding would perform better than wood siding. The quality of the siding that is currently available is not as good as it used to be.

Ms. Seaverson expressed concern that replacing the siding would not fix the problem. Mr. Bonsignore agreed that it would not fix the problem but it should respond better to the problem. Ms. Ferraro commented that this would provide an opportunity to watch the performance of the material. It may weather differently than the existing material, and become more obvious. Mr. Bonsignore stated that the cement fiber siding will look more crisp for a longer time. He stated that he has installed it on additions. If it is installed only on the front and doesn't extend around the corners, it should not be an obvious difference.

Mr. Tribu, supported by Mr. Oudsema, moved approval of Hardie Plank cement fiber siding or equivalent at 926 W. Main. The siding is to be installed to manufacturer's specifications. The finish should be smooth, the existing reveal is to be matched, and all existing trim is to remain. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

424 Douglas (Case #IHA 09-0289)

The applicant was not present at the meeting. The application requests construction of a new, two-car garage.

Ms. Ferraro advised that the front elevation will have a shed appearance with a flat front and a gable roof. The applicant is proposing to construct it 3½ feet from the garage of the neighbor to the south, and 12 feet from the property line. The applicant will be using the building for parking and storage. The property next door is owned by Josh Davis; there is a shared drive between the two houses. The neighbor received approval to tear down the existing garage and build a new garage.

Mr. Bonsignore advised that he couldn't approve the application without more details. Ms. Ferraro inquired if the HDC would like to postpone the decision on this application until next month. Ms. Seaverson suggested denying the application at this point, and requested that the applicant submit a site plan.

Ms. Seaverson, supported by Mr. Cinabro, moved denial regarding the request to build the new, two-car garage at 424 Douglas, pending further details from the applicant. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bonsignore suggesting finding out if the applicant would be allowed to build the garage in the proposed location, before putting this matter back on the HDC agenda. A variance may be required.

VII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (June 16, 2009)

The following changes were requested: Page 5, delete reference regarding the microphone. Page 6, last paragraph, take out everything after "details". Should read, ".....finding information about the original appearance of the south side of the house." Page 10, just prior to the approval, 8 feet soffits should be 8 inch soffits. The soffits on the addition should match the house. Page 3, paragraph 1, the sashes snap into the jambs.

Mr. Bonsignore, supported by Mr. Nave, moved approval of the June 16, 2009 HDC minutes as amended. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

Frank Mumford, Sir Home Improvement, and Dave Kiley, Marvin Windows, were present to provide information about replacement windows. Mr. Mumford stated that the pictures presented show the proposed replacement windows for Dr. Baraka-Love and Paul Love at 609 Elm. He distributed pictures to the HDC to substantiate the condition of the windows. Some of the glass is cracked and some of it is missing. Some of the sashes are rotted and cracked and some of the weather stripping is missing. The window frames are uneven.

Ms. Ferraro advised that 609 Elm was on the HDC agenda in April, but no one was present to discuss the project. Ms. Ferraro visited the property and spoke with the Dr.

Baraka-Love. She would like to replace four windows in the bedroom and one in the hall. The applicant wanted windows that are more energy efficient. Mr. Nave pointed out that there are no storm windows on the house. The windows have been reputted, but the putty was never painted so the putty and it is falling out. Ms. Ferraro suggested to the owner that she have the windows repaired rather than replaced.

Mr. Mumford advised that he spoke with Mike Shields from Blackberry, who advised that the cost would be \$1,200 to \$1,400 per unit, per window to replace the sashes. Dr. Baraka-Love is concerned about energy efficiency. The paint doesn't hold on the existing windows, and the caulk and putty have come out. Mr. Mumford questioned if the existing windows are repairable.

Ms. Ferraro referred to the recent window repair workshop that took place in Kalamazoo. The windows that the students worked on during the workshop were in worse shape than the windows at 609 Elm. The students were able to repair the windows and they are now working. Ms. Ferraro advised that she has no doubt that the windows at 609 Elm can be restored. The price for repairing windows in this condition would be in the range of \$400 to \$700. The addition of properly fitted storm windows will make a substantial difference in energy efficiency.

Mr. Mumford stated that he had been advised by Ms. Ferraro that her brother is in the window restoration business. Ms. Ferraro commented that she had provided other referrals to Dr. Baraka-Love. Mr. Mumford stated that he is representing the home owner. He didn't talk to all the references that were provided, but he spoke with Mike Shields from Blackberry. Further information can be provided upon request.

Mr. Mumford advised that the proposed windows fit the requirements of the historic area and they are energy efficient. The proposed windows will meet the government requirements for the stimulus package. Consumers Power is mandated to spend 2% of their revenue on these upgraded energy programs. Mr. Mumford will be meeting with Consumers to do a blower door analysis, which requires sealing up the house to test for air leaks. This procedure generally shows a 20% to 40% cubic feet per minute reduction in many of the homes that are tested.

Mr. Cinabro requested a review of what the HDC had previously determined regarding 609 Elm. Ms. Ferraro advised that the HDC postponed the decision on this property to allow the applicant more time to provide information. Mr. Cinabro commented that this property is not currently on the HDC agenda. Ms. Ferraro responded in the affirmative, and advised that no one appeared at the April HDC meeting to discuss the application. The information is now being presented to allow Mr. Mumford an opportunity to discuss the replacement windows that are available that might be applicable to this property.

Mr. Cinabro stated that he would prefer to continue the discussion when this matter is on the HDC agenda. He questioned if it would be possible to retain all of the information that is being presented, and if the correct process was being followed.

Mr. Oudsema commented that having a discussion about whether or not the materials presented are appropriate for the historic district would be acceptable. However, discussion regarding a specific property would require review of background information and placement of that property on the HDC agenda. He noted that 609 Elm was not on the July HDC agenda, and stated that he would not be interested in addressing it at this point. Mr. Mumford stated that he was presenting alternatives for fixing window sashes in the historic district. He provided a handout to the HDC showing examples at 609 Elm St. and surrounding properties. The unit presented is from Marvin Windows.

Mr. Kiley advised that the product being presented has been well-received in other parts of the state. One of the projects Mr. Kiley was involved with were the historic Grand Traverse lighthouse in Northport. That was approved through the State Historic Office in Lansing. The approval was for a wood insert, double-hung unit. A small, corner sample of the proposed window was presented to the HDC; a full sample is available upon request. The product presented is the same unit that was installed in the light house. The replacement windows can be done to different specifications to match what's in the home. Mr. Kiley stated that the historic details can be duplicated to be historically correct so it will be eligible for the historic tax credit.

Mr. Nave mentioned that the insert would add more jamb thickness; Mr. Kiley confirmed that to be correct. Mr. Nave stated that he has used Marvin windows (not in the historic district); he inquired as to the price difference between Marvin windows and the windows that are being proposed. Mr. Kiley advised that it would be more expensive to replace the whole unit. The proposed sash replacements would be about a ¼ of the cost of replacing the entire window. The sash replacements can be slipped in from the inside.

Mr. Oudsema inquired as to the average cost per window opening with the proposed product. Mr. Kiley stated that the cost would be \$460 per unit not including the installation. Ms. Ferraro mentioned that the energy credit is up to \$1,500 or 30% of the value of the material and does not cover labor. If the windows are restored and storm windows are installed, at an estimated \$1,000 per window, for all the restoration and the storm, the home owner receives a guaranteed \$1,500 as a tax credit through the Michigan Historic Preservation Tax Credit, instead of the percentage she would receive for replacing the windows.

Mr. Oudsema commented that there should be instances where the HDC will look at replacement windows. If people think they are getting a better value, they will advocate for that product. Mr. Nave stated that the HDC has been against certain replacement windows in the past because the plastic liner shows when the installation is done. The example presented shows less of the plastic liner. Mr. Kiley advised that there has been

advancement in the technology. Ideally, there should be a marriage between technology and what is acceptable to the HDC. The owner wants to improve the property but keep the appearance the same.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired as to what would be done with the space that needs to be trimmed out when the jambs are inserted, and what would be done to ensure there was no leakage around the sash. Mr. Mumford advised that the air pocket would be insulated and sealed; it will help provide air infiltration. There is a video on YouTube.com showing the installation process. This product has a 10-year warranty on the hardware, and a 20-year warranty on the glass. The Marvin window company has been around for 100 years. Sir Home Improvement will back the Marvin warranty (if there is a problem with the windows, Sir Home Improvement will fix it.) Mr. Bonsignore advised that the replacement windows would have to be approved on a case by case basis.

Mr. Tribu commented that many vendors have presented products to the HDC. A majority of items that wind up in dumps are building materials. He advised looking at ways to address problems. Restoring windows is very feasible and would save money. Mr. Mumford stated that people avoid the historic district because it's difficult to deal with the restrictions. Sir Home Improvement is green certified; the company recycles all of the glass they receive. Mr. Tribu commented that this product might be an option for installation in building additions. Mr. Mumford advised that the applicant is only replacing five windows; there should be options available.

Mr. Mumford inquired as to the next steps. Ms. Ferraro stated that Dr. Baraka-Love would need to contact her and request that the application for 609 Elm be place on the HDC agenda. Mr. Bonsignore advised that the HDC would need to know specifically what Dr. Baraka-Love is proposing to do with regard to the windows at that address.

B. FYI Report

Ms. Ferraro stated that 12 people attended the recent window restoration workshop. Those people are now qualified to repair windows.

Ms. Seaverson expressed concern regarding 609 Elm. She inquired if Dr. Baraka-Love provided anything in writing with regard to what was agreed upon. Ms. Ferraro advised that she did not receive anything in writing from the applicant with regard to what she work she is proposing. The applicant did not appear at the April meeting when the property was on the HDC agenda. However, she did submit an application but it was incomplete.

Mr. Oudsema expressed concern that people ignore directives from the HDC and there are no repercussions. He requested an update regarding 530 W. South Street. Ms. Ferraro advised that she had no further updates. Mr. Oudsema commended Ms. Ferraro for the work she does, but expressed concern that the violations at this address have existed for years. He commented that the situation with this property is unacceptable.

Ms. Ferraro stated that there were some funds leftover from the window workshop, so it may be possible to hold another workshop this fall or next spring. Marc Ferraro and Peter Carroll offered to coach the workshop graduates through their first project.

The National Alliance for Historic Preservation Commissions will be holding a conference in Grand Rapids next year. They provide hands-on workshops, tours and on-site lab work. One of their tours will be of the Kalamazoo historic districts. Ms. Ferraro is looking for volunteers to help with the conference. Volunteers can attend the conference for free.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. DeYoung, supported by Mr. Oudsema, moved to adjourn the July 21, 2009 meeting of the Historic District Commission. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Prepared by: _____ Dated: _____
Recording Secretary

Reviewed by: _____ Dated: _____
Staff Liaison

Approved by: _____ Dated: _____
HDC Chair