

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
Minutes  
August 18, 2009

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, City Hall  
City Commission Chambers  
241 W. South St., Kalamazoo, MI 49007

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

Members Excused: Robert Cinabro

Members Absent: Erin Seaverson (*see below\**)

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**

Mr. Cinabro informed city staff that he would not be present at the August 18<sup>th</sup> HDC meeting. (*\*Erin Seaverson informed city staff at the July meeting that she would be on vacation in August.*)

**Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved approval of Mr. Cinabro's absence from the August 18, 2009 HDC meeting. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

### **III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (August 18, 2009)**

There were no changes to the Agenda.

**Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved approval of the August 18, 2009 HDC agenda as submitted. 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. 609 ELM (Case #: IHA 09-0127)**

Frank Mumford, owner of Sir Home Improvement, and Dave Kiley, representative from Marvin Windows, were present to discuss the application. The application requests replacement of five windows in the southwest second floor (master bedroom and upper hall).

Mr. Mumford stated that he received information from Ms. Ferraro regarding historic windows. She also included a copy of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines, and advised that it is the responsibility of the HDC, as specified in state law (PA 169) and the City of Kalamazoo Code of Ordinance (chapter 16) to apply the standards.

Mr. Mumford advised that he is not proposing to change the look or color of the home; he is proposing to upgrade the home based on the standards. Standard #1 states that the property shall be used for its historic purpose that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment. The applicants are proposing minimal changes to the building and site. Standard #2 states that the historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided. Mr. Kiley will be presenting a sample of the proposed window unit and advising why it will maintain the historic look and appeal of the home. Standard #3 states that each property shall be recognized as a physical record of time....” “..... adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.” The applicants will not be eliminating any features, they want to enhance the property. Standard #5 states, “Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved. Mr. Mumford stated that the muntins and other features of the proposed replacement windows will preserve the look of what is currently there. Standard #6 states that deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Mr. Mumford stated that the applicant will be following the guidelines and, hopefully, the interpretation by the board will be that the guidelines have been followed.

Mr. Mumford advised that he didn't interpret the proposed replacement windows as being an infringement on the standards. He referred to information he received in an e-mail from Ms. Ferraro, which he thought had been forwarded to the HDC. Ms. Ferraro forwarded the e-mail to individuals in other historic districts to inquire as to their opinions regarding this application. It appears that in most cases, other historic districts are in favor of installing replacement windows in some instances. Mr. Mumford quoted

the following e-mail response: "In certain instances, we have allowed replacement windows (most often for earlier replacement windows from the Bicentennial period)." (Erik F. Nelson, Senior Planner, City of Fredericksburg, VA). Marvin Windows were referred to in some instances as being the window of choice. Mr. Mumford quoted another portion of the e-mail as follows: "As is also the case with some Jeld-Wen windows, there are some cases when some Marvin windows work for specific historic rehab tax credit projects, as well. (Kristin E. S. Zapalac, Ph.D., Greensboro, NC). "Our guidelines don't completely rule out replacement windows and we occasionally get applications. Our commission has allowed this specific brand of replacement window on one occasion and similar products on two projects funded by the City's lead grant." (Mike Cowhig, Dept. of Housing and Community Development, City of Greensboro, NC). Robb McKay, Michigan State Historic Preservation Office states as follows: "The NPS has made it very clear that they will accept window replacement as a component of a certified rehabilitation project. Like it or not, right or wrong, for good or for bad, replacement has been, is, and will continue to be, a part of an overall rehabilitation strategy. Whether it is windows, plaster, mechanical systems, roofing materials, interior or exterior finish materials, the character of the property and those characteristics which make it eligible for listing in the National Register."

Mr. Mumford presented pictures showing the window units on 609 Elm Street. Some of the windows are proposed for replacement, others will not be replaced. There are more than just these four or five windows that are in bad shape, there are windows in other areas of the house that are also in bad condition. It is Mr. Mumford's understanding that Ms. Baraka-Love plans to eventually replace all of the windows in the house. She plans on living in the house for a long time and she would like to have the windows taken care of.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired as to which of the windows in the pictures are being replaced. Mr. Mumford advised that he didn't list which windows are being proposed for replacement. Mr. Bonsignore commented that several of the windows appear as though they do not need replacing. He pointed out a specific window in the pictures. Mr. Mumford stated that the applicant had painted the window, but it wouldn't hold paint on the bottom because it was rotting. The window frame would have to be replaced. This picture doesn't show the sill, but it is shown in other pictures. Mr. Bonsignore stated that the sill doesn't need to be replaced. Mr. Mumford advised that the sill would not be replaced with the insert window. The sill would be covered with a new sill over the existing sill as part of the replacement window unit.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if jamb inserts are part of the new proposal. Mr. Mumford advised that he brought jamb inserts to show the commission. He stated that the window units need to be replaced, and he is proposing to install the Marvin units.

Mr. Nave referred to another set of pictures and inquired if the windows in the photos of the courthouse and the Traverse City house provided by Mr. Mumford had already been replaced. Mr. Mumford responded in the affirmative. He deferred further questions to Mr. Kiley to provide further details.

Mr. Kiley referred to pictures of the historic courthouse in Traverse City Michigan, which has the same type of insert windows the applicant is proposing to install in her house. The exterior casings were removed from the courthouse and replaced with the clad extruded aluminum units that match the lower windows. The same units in wood are being proposed for 609 Elm. Mr. Kiley provided pictures of a house in the Cherry Hill Historic District in Grand Rapids, MI showing all wood insert replacement windows.

Mr. Nave inquired as to the silver line around the window. Mr. Kiley advised that it is a combination storm window in a wood frame. It is a storm over a sash replacement. There is also a wooden storm window and wooden storm screen available.

Mr. Kiley provided pictures of the Grand Traverse light house, showing the double-hung, wood inserts with the replacement storm windows and screens.

Ms. Ferraro mentioned that the Grand Traverse Court house is owned by the County. The light house is owned by the Light House Society. Those are both non-profit entities.

Mr. Kiley provided pictures of the interior of the home in the Cherry Hill Historic District in Grand Rapids, showing the replacement insert. The original trim was restored and placed back on the windows. The side of the window jamb shows the track but mostly the wood is what shows.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if the trim had to be removed in order for the insert to be installed. Normally, the trim is not removed. Mr. Kiley advised that the applicants chose to remove the trim because they wanted to restore the trim and then reinstall it.

Ms. Ferraro commented that it makes a difference if the replacement windows are proposed for a local historic district where there is a strong review.

The applicants provided pictures of a house in Petoskey near the Gas Light district. The house was set to be demolished, but someone purchased and restored the home. It is currently being used as office suites. The owner received a beautification award from the Chamber of Commerce for improving the building but not changing the look of it. The same insert double-hung windows that are being proposed for 609 Elm were installed in the house in Petoskey. The original trim and other details were reused to preserve the historical accuracy. The house is located in a historic district in downtown Petoskey.

The examples shown all used the windows that are being proposed for 609 Elm. Marvin Windows are wood replacement windows. Clad windows are available, but the material underneath is always solid wood. Mr. Kiley provided a demonstration of how the replacement windows are installed in the frame and how they operate. In older homes, the bevel on the sill is usual less (more?) than on modern windows. Marvin can match the bevel on older homes to maintain the historic look. The bevel would be created by adding less than 3/4" to the top of the existing sill. The clad windows are made of extruded

aluminum and they are available in many different colors. The simulated divided lights are divided with spacers between the glass for an authentic look.

Mr. Nave requested clarification regarding the location of the master bedroom where the applicant is requesting the replacement windows. Ms. Ferraro advised that the two windows on upper right side of the house, the two windows in the rear. The single window in the rear (to the left of the pair of windows) is in a hallway. There are three ribbon lites in the upper sash and a single lite below. Those five windows are under consideration for replacement at this time. One of the photos provided by the applicants shows a casement window from the house with muntins dividing the window into four lites. Mr. Kiley advised that the sample window he brought today is smaller than the windows the applicant wants replaced at 609 Elm. Mr. Mumford stated that these Marvin replacement windows qualify for the energy tax credit along with other work being done on the house by Sir Home Improvement.

Ms. Ferraro inquired as to how much difference there will be on the outside of the windows Dr. Baraka-Love has chosen compared to the sample provided. She also inquired if the interior trim would be removed. Mr. Mumford advised that the stops would be removed, and the new unit will fit into the existing opening. The original trim will be reinstalled. The sample is smaller, which makes it look as though it has more frame. When it is actually installed in the opening, there will be a slight decrease in the amount of glass showing (about 2" total on both side).

Ms. Ferraro advised that she would be able to tell the difference from a distance between the original and the replacement windows. In a window with true divided lights there is a slight difference in the reflection of the individual pieces of glass, while a replacement window with a single sheet of glass and false muntins, reflects evenly.

Mr. Bonsignore referred to the spec sheet and inquired if the replacement windows would have half screens. Mr. Mumford advised that the replacement windows come standard with the half screen. Mr. Kiley stated that the half screen sits under the sash. Mr. Bonsignore commented that the location of the half screen would prevent the unit from being used as a double-hung window. Mr. Kiley advised that the screen can be installed on the outside and it would be sealed against the check rail with a weather strip. With that option, the unit would always remain as a double-hung window. Generally, people like the full screen; it could be done either way.

Mr. Bonsignore advised that the specs mentioned deluxe aluminum capping. Mr. Mumford stated that the exterior would normally be wrapped. However, that will not happen in this case, because the unit will be painted. The replacement windows would be consistent with what is currently in the house. The example contract provided to the HDC doesn't necessarily represent what will be happening at 609 Elm. Mr. Bonsignore expressed concern that personal information of the applicant was included on the information presented as part of the public record. Ms. Ferraro advised that she would block out that information before it is made public.

**Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Oudsema, moved to accept the application for 609 Elm as presented. Trim on the outside of the house should match the original trim. This matter is not to be precedent setting. With a roll call vote, the motion failed with a vote of three ayes and to two nays.**

**Ayes: Mr. Nave, Mr. Oudsema, Ms. DeYoung**

**Nays: Mr. Tribu, Mr. Bonsignore**

Mr. Tribu questioned if the windows really need to be replaced. He inquired as to the cost of the replacement windows. Mr. Mumford stated that the total cost of the replacement windows is \$6,905, including some other weather proofing to done.

Mr. Nave inquired as to the definition of e-shield. Mr. Mumford advised that e-shield is a reflective energy product that goes into the attic space. It is an aluminum foil with insulation. The product is used primarily down south to reflect the sun's rays and help cool the building. It can also be used as insulation in the attic space to reflect heat back into the home.

Mr. Oudsema commented that some home owners will invest time and money to restore existing windows. Other owners may decide to get new, solid wood windows for a similar price that will mimic the characteristics of the existing windows. The heart of the question is to ensure that the wood replacement window is a good quality window that will give the same appearance as the existing window. Mr. Oudsema advised that he thought that would be happening in this case and that is why he seconded the motion.

Mr. Bonsignore referred to standard #6 and inquired as to how Mr. Oudsema would interpret that standard. Mr. Oudsema referred to a statement by Robb McKay, and stated that he agreed that replacement is part of the process, and not everything has to stay original. Certain parts of a structure get replaced as a normal course, such as roofs, siding and porches. Mr. Oudsema advised that he felt the HDC would not be ignoring their reason for existence, which is to see that these houses are maintained and brought forward in a historic, sensible manner, if the replacement windows are approved.

Mr. Bonsignore quoted Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines #6, "Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced." Mr. Oudsema advised that the issues comes down to a question of whether the windows are repairable or not and, if so, what does repairable really mean? Does it mean that a little time and energy will be invested or does it mean spending a similar amount of money or more for a brand new product. It is a discretionary matter, depending on how you interpret "repair."

Mr. Bonsignore advised that the pictures presented show windows that can be repaired. Mr. Oudsema commented that anything can be repaired, if someone is willing to spend the time and energy to do it. There are approximately 2,000 historic structures under the jurisdiction of the HDC. Not everyone has the capacity or the willingness to go to the

99<sup>th</sup> percentile. Mr. Oudsema stated that he felt that the applicant's request was reasonable and he is comfortable with it.

Mr. Tribu commented that he didn't have really good pictures of all of the existing windows. The liners and other parts of the replacement windows will break eventually, and will probably be replaced in the near future. The old windows can be fixed. He commented that \$6,500 for five replacement windows seems like a lot of money. It should be possible to rebuild the old windows and maintain the energy efficiency and quality of the old windows for the price that is being quoted for the new windows. Repairing the old windows would seem preferable to discarding them in the dump.

Mr. Nave commented that, in the past, the HDC tried to convince the applicant that other options are available. It appears that she is not pursuing other options. From the street, the replacement windows look the same, and he felt they would be acceptable. Mr. Mumford stated he has a letter from Ms. Baraka-Love that was not included in the HDC packets. The letter was provided to the HDC.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Bonsignore requested a roll call vote on the motion. The vote was three to two in favor of the motion. Ms. Ferraro explained that the vote failed because a majority of the appointed commissioners must vote in favor of the motion in order for it to pass, not just a majority of the commissioners present. Since there are seven appointed commissioners, four commissioners would need to vote in favor of the motion in order for it to pass.

Mr. Oudsema suggested that the applicant should have been informed of the quorum rule prior to the vote. Ms. Ferraro advised that it has been the habit of the commission to inform the applicants that four votes are needed to pass a motion when there is only a quorum (four members) of the HDC members present. In this instance, with five members present, there is more than a quorum of HDC members present.

Mr. Mumford requested further explanation of the vote so he could advise the homeowner. He questioned how he could receive a majority vote in favor of the motion, but the applicant cannot have the windows she is requesting. Mr. Bonsignore explained that a majority of the total commission must vote in favor of an application in order for it to be approved. Ms. Ferraro advised that the HDC is a seven-member board, two of the commissioners are absent. Mr. Mumford inquired if four commissioners were present and only one voted no, the motion would fail? Ms. Ferraro confirmed that statement to be correct. That is the parliamentary procedure that is written into the city's code of ordinance. However, in the past when there have been similar situations, the applicant is advised that he/she is welcome to attend the HDC meeting next month when the full commission is present.

Mr. Oudsema stated that the applicant should have been offered that option in the beginning. Once an application is acted upon and it fails, it cannot be brought back to the commission unless there are material changes made. It should be made clear to all applicants who appear in front of the HDC that four affirmative votes are required for a

motion to pass. If the applicant is not prepared to take the chance of getting four out of five votes, they are welcome to come back at the following meeting and, hopefully, more HDC members will be present. Ms. Ferraro suggested making a motion offering the applicant the opportunity to come back next month.

Mr. Mumford expressed concern that if he returned to the HDC next month and the same commissioners are present, he would have to return the month after that. Ms. Ferraro stated that two additional commissioners should be present next month. Mr. Mumford commented that he has no way of knowing that the full commission will be present next month; there were supposed to be six commissioners present at the August meeting. Mr. Bonsignore advised that the HDC is comprised of volunteers and there is no way of knowing ahead of time which members will be present.

Mr. Oudsema advised that this is not an easy question. Everyone who serves on the HDC serves out of good will and there will be differences of opinion. The applicant has a cause and a situation that will result in different opinions among the commissioners. The reality is that the applicant needs four affirmative votes. Mr. Mumford advised that he appreciated the opportunity to come back to the HDC. Ms. Ferraro suggested that the commission make a motion to that effect.

**Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Nave, moved that the HDC allow the applicant for 609 Elm to reapply at a future HDC meeting of their choice, with no prejudice. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

Ms. Ferraro advised that she would add information regarding the voting requirements to the disclaimer and the letter that is sent to the applicants.

## **VII. NEW BUSINESS**

### **B. 753 Academy (Case #: IHV 09-0341)**

Dave Marschke was present to represent the property. The application requests rebuilding of the rear first and second floor porches.

Mr. Bonsignore explained to the applicant that he would need four votes in favor of his application in order for it to pass. Mr. Nave will be abstaining from the vote due to his involvement with the application.

Mr. Marschke advised that he wants to clean up the back of the property, and go back to the original configuration. The applicant has sought Mr. Nave's assistance with regard to the architectural details of the staircases. The applicant is also seeking the advice of a structural engineer. Information included in the HDC packets shows the architectural details in a light printing, and the structural details in a darker printing.

The applicant would like to save the existing porch floor, roof, beams, and ceiling. He would also like to save as many of the columns as possible. One of the columns has been

replaced with treated lumber, and the other one doesn't appear to be salvageable. The 2 x members under the porch are sound except for one that is split. The structural engineer shows replacement of the two middle members, with two new posts extending to the ground. The porch is sitting on concrete blocks from the 1920's. The replacement blocks that don't match the age of the house, they were probably wood originally. The replacement column will look like the one above, and there will be a foundation underneath each column. A new railing will be installed on the first floor and on the roof to match historic district standards. The edge of the roof deck will be set back so it won't be seen as much, and it sits on the beam below for structural purposes.

The existing porch can be saved. The railing, the columns underneath, and the top porch deck are newer. The staircases leading to the third floor will be removed, and the staircase leading from the second floor to the ground will also be removed. The first floor steps will be rebuilt to standards.

Ms. Ferraro advised that the porch is split on the first floor to accommodate the basement egress between the porches. Mr. Nave stated that the house had been configured as multiple apartments and the stairs were required as access. The house is now a duplex and doesn't require the same access.

Mr. Oudsema inquired as to what changes would be made at the roof level. Ms. Ferraro stated that the skylights will remain but everything else will be gone.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if it would be possible to get a waiver for the 42" height requirement for the railing. Ms. Ferraro advised that may not be possible on the second floor of a student rental. There are designs that will minimize the height difference. If the original rail still existed on the second floor it might be possible to issue a waiver, but the original rail is not there. In this instance, the 42" height is acceptable.

**Mr. Tribu, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved approval of the application as submitted with work to standards. Details to be worked out with the coordinator. With a roll call vote, the motion carried with four ayes and one abstention. Mr. Nave abstained.**

**C. 617 W. South Street (Case #: IHV 09-0342)**

Marcia and Jerry Danner were present to represent the property. The application requests removal and repair of the rear/south chimney and repair of the north chimney and roof.

Ms. Danner advised that she spoke with several contractors and they all suggested a different approach. The applicants are seeking advice from the HDC with regard to which approach is acceptable.

Mr. Danner advised that they want a new roof. The contractors have advised that the chimneys might as well be repaired when the roof is installed. The following suggestions have been made:

- #1. Tear down both chimneys because they are not used.
- #2. Restore the chimneys with new tuck pointing and new bricks.
- #3 Tear down the small, secondary chimney on the back and reuse the bricks from that chimney to repair the main chimney on the front of the house.
- #4. Rebuild the front chimney in the same style but not as tall.

Some of the roofing contractors have advised that the chimneys are taller than they need to be. Rebuilding the chimney at a lower height would also save money. The applicants are seeking advice on which options are acceptable to the HDC.

Mr. Oudsema advised that his preference would be to have the chimneys rebuilt. This is a lovely home on one of the most historically distinctive streets in the community. This house is all brick and sits on a corner so it is quite visible. He inquired if the applicants received an estimate on rebuilding the chimneys with new materials that would be similar to the existing brick. Mr. Danner stated that he received a quote about two years ago for tearing down the main chimney and rebuilding it. The quote was between \$11,000 and \$12,000 just for the main chimney, and the applicants did not pursue that option. The contractors they have spoken with recently suggested talking with the HDC with regard to what would be acceptable, and then obtaining a quote.

Mr. Nave advised that he lives at 610 West South Street, across the street from the subject property. He had three chimneys rebuild (each 5' to 6' high) and that was about \$4,000 nine years ago. The applicants advised that they spoke with Mark Hanson from Parchment Chimney, Dick O'Day, and Kevin Radke. Mr. Radke provided the highest quote.

Mr. Nave inquired if the larger base on the back chimney is typical. Ms. Ferraro confirmed that it is typical. The back chimney is made of a softer red brick; the front chimney is made from the same glazed brick as the rest of the house. The base of the rear chimney appears to have already been reinforced, and the brick looks different.

Mr. Nave suggested eliminated a foot or two from the height of the front chimney and one foot from the back chimney, and rebuilding them to match. Mr. Oudsema suggested taking down the back chimney since it is not visible. It would be preferable to have the front chimney rebuilt to the same scale. Discussion followed as to the visibility of chimneys from the road. Depending on the time of year, the chimneys are visible from multiple vantage points, although the rear chimney is visible year round from Oak Street..

Mr. Danner stated that one of the contractors advised that the front chimney is made of a soft brick, similar to the brick in the rear chimney. The front chimney has a wide base similar to the one in back. The chimneys could be painted a color that is acceptable to the HDC.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if any of the fireplaces are hooked up to either of the chimneys. Mr. Danner advised that they are blocked off. They haven't been used in a number of years, the applicants were uncertain as to the exact amount of time.

Mr. Nave suggested installing a metal cap over the top of the chimneys to divert the water. Mr. Bonsignore advised that the chimneys at his property are no longer in use. Dick O'Day put a cement cap on the chimneys to prevent anything from getting into them. Even if the flues are intact and operable, the chimneys need either a concrete or metal cap to prevent water from damaging the flues or the brick. The city must be assured that there is nothing hooked up to the chimney if it is going to be sealed off. Ms. Ferraro suggested getting a quote from Dick O'Day. Mr. Bonsignore advised that the cost of fixing his chimney was much less than \$11,000. Ms. Ferraro mentioned that this project could be eligible for the 25% historic tax credit.

Discussion followed with regard to the visibility of the chimneys. The rear chimney appears to be in better repair than the front chimney, and is visible from Lovell and Oak Streets. Mr. Tribu advised against removing the chimneys because they are prominent features and they add architectural value to the house.

**Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved approval of repair of the existing chimneys at 617 W. South Street, by tuck pointing and replacing brick as needed, provided that the scale and height of the chimneys are not altered, and with the understanding that both chimneys are likely to be painted a color similar to the main paint color used on the home. The owner is to be allowed the choice of capping the chimneys. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Danner stated that he would not shorten the chimneys if there are to be repaired. They would only be shortened if they were replaced, in order to save money. Mr. Bonsignore advised that if the chimneys are to be painted, it is not necessary to use salvaged bricks. It would probably be less expensive to buy new bricks.

#### **708 Eleanor (Case #: IHV 09-0343)**

Ms. Ferraro represented the property at the owner's request. The application requests removal of the existing back porch with extensive carpenter ant damage and wood rot, and replacement with back entry steps to historic district standards.

Ms. Ferraro provided color pictures of the property. The rail is being replaced to historic standards. The owner needs approval to reconfigure the back porch. Ms. Ferraro is 95% certain that the existing porch is not original to the house. You can see through the porch ceiling and the original clapboards still exist along the back of the house. The foundation under the porch is smooth face concrete block, which is of a time period much later than the house. Ms. Ferraro advised that removing the porch would not be huge loss. The applicant would like to replace it with something else at a later date, but right now she just wants to eradicate the carpenter ants. Where the porch is attached to the house, there are gaps from the porch to the attic that are letting in air and wildlife.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if removal of the porch would include repair of any damaged siding to match the rest of the house. Ms. Ferraro confirmed that the siding would be

repaired, and a 3' x 3' platform and steps will be constructed by the back door to meet historic district standards. There will be no roof over the back steps at this point.

**Mr. Nave, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved to accept the application for 708 Eleanor as submitted. Any damage created by removing the roof and other materials would be repaired to match the existing materials. With a roll call vote the motion carried unanimously.**

## **VII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**

Ms. DeYoung requested the following changes: Page 3, last paragraph, should read, "if storm doors were to be installed over the wood doors." Page 9, "performance of the material ... "it" may weather differently. Page 13, discussion regarding 609 Elm, it should be noted that Mr. Cinabro left the meeting during the discussion.

**Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Tribu, moved approval of the minutes as amended. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

## **XII. OTHER BUSINESS:**

### **A. FYI Report**

Ms. Ferraro advised that the number of approvals this year is almost identical to the numbers last year. However, more substantial repairs are being requested such as roofs, steps and rails.

Mr. Nave suggested finding another architect to assist with some of these projects. There are very few architects in the city, but they would necessarily need to reside in the city limits to provide assistance with projects. Mr. Oudsema suggested maintaining a list of 4 or 5 architects with contact information to be handed out to applicants when needed. Currently, Mr. Nave is placed in the position of being the only architect on the HDC and applicants seek his advice for the projects they are doing. Mr. Oudsema expressed concern about Mr. Nave appearing in front of the HDC on a regular basis. This could mistakenly convey the message that this is the normal course of action for completing a project.

Ms. Ferraro stated that she has a list of approved contractors. Contractors are eligible to be on the list if they complete a project in the historic district that has been approved. Currently, there are only two architects on the list. It was suggested that Kent DeBoer, Michael Dunn and Brendan Pollard be contacted to find out if they are interested. Mr. Nave stated that he would send an e-mail to a local group of architects to find out if there are people who are interested in being on the list.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved to adjourn the August 18, 2009 meeting of the Historic District Commission. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Recording Secretary

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Staff Liaison

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
HDC Chair

Date: \_\_\_\_\_