

City of Kalamazoo  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
Minutes  
August 17, 2010  
*DRAFT*

City Commission Chambers  
Second Floor, City Hall  
Kalamazoo, MI 49007

Members Present: Jay Bonsignore, Chair; Erin Seaverson, Vice Chair; Robert Cinabro; Linda DeYoung; Nelson Nave; Chris Roussi; James Tribu

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

Guests: Barb Miller, City Commissioner; Jeff Chamberlain, Director of Community Planning and Development

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**II. APPROVAL OF ABSENCES**

None

**III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Ms. Ferraro requested that 504 Douglas and 721 Forrest be removed from the agenda. She also requested the addition of a presentation by Jeff Chamberlain regarding 531 Eleanor.

**Mr. Cinabro, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved approval of the August 17, 2010 HDC agenda as amended. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

**V. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

None

**VI. DISCLAIMER**

Ms. Ferraro read the disclaimer into the record.

**VII. OLD BUSINESS**

None

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. 802 S. Park (IHA 10-0221)**

Linda Beuhler, owner, was present to represent the property. The application requests removal and storage of the second floor rear balcony. The door will be sealed from the inside.

Ms. Beuhler advised that carpenter ants and squirrels have destroyed the balcony. The main supports are extensions of the floor joists in the house and it would be difficult to access them. About six inches of sound wood extends from inside the house to the floor of the balcony making which may not be enough to rebuild the balcony. She inquired as to what should be done about the balcony. The access door is screwed shut now because the condition of the balcony presents a liability, and she would like to have the door removed or made inoperable from the inside and remove and store the store the railing and brackets for a future owner to use. Another option would be to cover up the rotten wood and replace wood as needed for a cosmetic repair, and block off the door. This property is a rental and she can't trust the tenants to not use the balcony.

Mr. Tribu inquired if the applicant had estimates for repair of the deck; Ms. Beuhler advised that she did not.

**Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Tribu, moved to deny the application for 802 S. Park requesting the removal of the balcony. The balcony should be restored to match the original. The brackets underneath should be reused. The wrought iron railing, fascia and trim should match. The ¼ round trim and bead board or tongue and groove ceiling should be installed per standards #5 and #6. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

Ms. Beuhler inquired if she would have to rip up the floor and sub-flooring to access the floor joists. Mr. Nave advised that the balcony should be restored to match the original. This is one of the best houses in the neighborhood for its era. The balcony is one of the best features on the exterior of the building and matches the one on the front of the house.

Ms. Beuhler inquired if the flooring in the room would need to be removed. Mr. Nave suggested that Ms. Beuhler hire a structural engineer; he may be able to design repairs without tearing up the floor. Ms. Beuhler inquired as to the cost of hiring an engineer; Mr. Nave advised that it would cost approximately \$200.

Historic District Commission Minutes

August 17, 2010

Page 3 of 14

Mr. Bonsignore mentioned that the applicant's property is subject to the housing code, which stated that she can't leave the door if she removes the porch. Replacing the porch wouldn't be much more expensive than replacing the door and the brick. Ms. Beuhler was advised by someone in the inspections division that she would be able to leave the door in place. Ms. Ferraro advised that the door would be walled over on the inside.

Mr. Bonsignore commented that the biggest question about replacing the porch is the strength of the brackets. He stated that he would be willing to approve wooden brackets like the ones in the photo. The brackets could be structural and that would not destroy the appearance of the house. Mr. Roussi commented that chain supports might also be appropriate. The headers above the windows might be strong enough to hold that type of support; a structural engineer would be able to make that determination.

Mr. Nave commented that S brackets are an essential element of this house; they would be expensive to replace. Ms. Ferraro mentioned that there is already a rail height waiver in place.

Ms. Seaverson mentioned that this application is just for removal of the rail. It is a distinctive feature of the house. Before conjecture regarding appropriate alternatives, the applicant needs to consult with an engineer. The applicant will need to return to the HDC with a different solution to address other problems. She suggested that if the balcony is dangerous, it should be taken down temporarily, with a time limit for something to be done.

Mr. Cinabro mentioned that the HDC is guided by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, which states that a deteriorated feature must be repaired rather than replaced. However, there is a liability issue in this instance. He encouraged the applicant to work with Ms. Ferraro to determine the cost for repairing the balcony. He inquired if Ms. Beuhler would be willing to postpone the decision until the cost estimates can be obtained.

Ms. Ferraro advised that she could meet with the applicant to discuss engineers and solutions for the balcony. Ms. Beuhler stated that she is concerned regarding the safety of the balcony. The house is rented for fall term. The door to the balcony is screwed shut but the adjacent windows are operable. It might be possible to climb a ladder and unscrew the door to access the balcony. She was not sure if the windows are big enough for someone to get through.

Ms. Ferraro suggested that the applicant contact her before the end of the week to discuss possible options for the balcony.

Mr. Bonsignore advised that the HDC denied the application because there was no alternative presented. If the applicant returns to the HDC with a plan to replace the balcony, it might be approved.

**C. 1525 Academy (Case #: IHA 10-0244)**

John Zito, contractor, was present to represent the property. The application requests a garage addition.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if a materials list was available. Ms. Ferraro advised that some of the details are contained in the e-mail that was provided. It states that Hardie-board or a similar product would be used for the siding.

Mr. Nave commented that if the proposed addition would be close to the house. Mr. Zito advised that there would be about eight feet between the house and the garage addition. There is no intention to connect the house and the garage. There is a stairway going into the house at that location.

Mr. Nave mentioned that two cars were parked closely together by the doors. If the addition is constructed, there won't be space behind the house. The corner of the house interrupts the garage door in the future. You can't drive straight into the garage by the west corner; the closer the garage is to the house, the more difficult the angle will be. Mr. Zito advised that the addition would extend up to the fence by the entry. Mr. Nave commented that it seems odd to fill up that space. Mr. Zito advised that the owners are aware of that; they are trying to get all of their vehicles under cover.

Mr. Nave inquired if there was a question about the brick. Mr. Zito stated that it was his understanding that the brick should not match the existing brick; there should be a distinction between old and new. He plans to install burgundy-colored brick, which will be similar but will not match the original. He is proposing to install a steel door, which will be the same size as the existing door. The existing door will not be reused because sections of it are deteriorated. It is not an original door, but it may be from the period of significance, which ended in the 1950's. Mr. Zito stated that the new door will look as much like the old one as possible. He will try to match the new service door to the old one. There are currently half-round gutters on the garage; the new gutters will be extended. The existing ones are a newer-type, copper-lined gutter.

Mr. Roussi referred to the aerial photo and drawing. It looks like two cars can't move in and out of that area. If there's a car on the left, it would be completely blocked. Mr. Nave inquired if the applicants want a three or four car garage. Mr. Zito stated that the dimensions indicate it will be a three-car garage; the car in the addition will go in on an angle.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if there are any zoning issues with the proposed garage addition. Mr. Zito stated that he was not aware of any zoning issues. Ms. Ferraro advised that there is plenty of space for the addition.

Ms. Seaverson referred to the aerial photo and inquired as to the area by the garage. It appears there is a structure connecting the house to the garage. Mr. Zito advised that it is a covered walkway. The area with the flat roof in back of the house is an enclosed porch; it is an addition to the house.

Discussion continued with regard to the close proximity of the proposed garage addition to the house, and the available access to the back yard. Mr. Zito advised that the steps are original to the house, and the gate provides access to the enclosed area by the garage.

Ms. Seaverson commented that the spatial relationship between the house and garage has already been altered. It is up to the owner if they want to park on an angle; there are garages built close to the rear of houses. She expressed a preference for a wood door rather than a steel door. The door is a prominent feature of the garage and can be seen from the street. Ms. Ferraro mentioned that the HDC has been allowing steel, overhead doors that look like wood. The long, narrow 1950's-style windows are more of a prominent feature than the material. Ms. Seaverson stated that since there is a precedent, it would be acceptable to have a steel door that looks like it is from the appropriate era. Ms. Ferraro commented that there are many doors that are appropriate for the age of this house. The biggest difference would be that the new door would have four light windows rather than three narrow windows as it currently is. She offered to work out the details of the door with the owner.

Ms. Seaverson suggested using something more appropriate than a flood light on the front of the garage. Mr. Zito stated that there is currently a security light with a motion detector on the front of the garage.

Mr. Roussi referred to Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines #9, which states that new construction must be compatible with the massing, size, and scale to protect the historic integrity. The proposed garage exceeds the length of part of the house; it's almost as big as another house and may be out of scale. Ms. Ferraro advised that it won't appear bigger from the street. Making it taller would be a problem.

**Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Cinabro, moved approval of the application for 1525 Academy. The new door is to match the old door in appearance. It should be flat rather than having faux cedar wood. The trim, siding and features are to match the original. The man door is to match the original. If the garage is reroofed, the roofing and drip edge are to be dark to match historic district standards. The gutters are to match the existing. It is suggested that a more appropriate light fixture be installed on the front of the garage. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

**E. 420 Douglas (Case #: IHA 10-0245)**

Joshua Davis, owner, was present to discuss the application. The application requests that a "Neighborhood Watch" sign be posted on a private residence.

Historic District Commission Minutes

August 17, 2010

Page 6 of 14

Mr. Davis advised that he would like to be the test case for posting a neighborhood watch sign on private property. About three years ago a woman from New Jersey moved to the neighborhood. She had been involved with neighborhood watch and she became involved with the neighborhood association. She thought that posting the signs significantly reduced the crime rate. The Neighborhood Association Board of Directors and a majority of the residents decided these signs might be beneficial in the Stuart Neighborhood. There were discussions with the City of Kalamazoo regarding the number of signs to be placed in the neighborhood. The safety committee wanted more than 25 signs posted; the city advised that they could post nine signs. They have been placed on Stuart, Woodward and Elm at North, W. Main and W. Kalamazoo; there are no signs on Douglas or Allen Blvd. The signs are 12" x 18" and are tailored to the Stuart Neighborhood.

Mr. Davis advised that there are nine or ten signs left and no one else is requesting them at this point. The signs are the property of SARA (Stuart Area Restoration Association) and would remain so; ownership of the signs would not be transferred to the property owner. Mr. Davis is requesting that Ms. Ferraro be given authority to provide administrative approval for placement of neighborhood watch signs on properties that have suitable locations for the signs. He is also requesting that a sign be placed in an area that faces the public right-of-way. He is hoping the sign will benefit the entire neighborhood. If someone wants to place one of these signs on a free-standing post, that type of request should come before the HDC. The sign should be placed a little further left and lower than what the computer image shows.

Mr. Bonsignore stated that he would abstain from voting on this matter because he is on the SARA board.

Mr. Cinabro inquired if the request was to authorize Ms. Ferraro to approve the signs on a case by case basis, with not more than one sign to be approved for any property. Mr. Davis responded in the affirmative; he suggested that one sign per block would be appropriate.

Mr. Tribu inquired as to the advantage of having these signs posted with parking signs. Ms. Ferraro stated that the city is concerned about having too many signs because that may cause an area to look cluttered. The Traffic Engineer advised that too many signs could be distracting to motorists and may cause accidents. Mr. Davis stated that the Traffic Engineer didn't want any signs posted. The Board of Directors approached the Assistant City Attorney who overruled the Traffic Engineer's decision. There are no neighborhood watch signs on Douglas; the east side of Douglas is part of the Stuart Historic District. Posting a sign in the proposed location would not be distracting since it is on private property. Mr. Davis would like to participate in this program to help facilitate the Safety Committee's goal to reduce crime in the Stuart Neighborhood. Crime has been historically low in the Stuart Neighborhood, but lowering it further is a goal.

Ms. Seaverson inquired about neighborhood watch stickers. Mr. Davis advised that there are decals with adhesive that can be placed in windows or doors. He was unsure if the decals were under the jurisdiction of the HDC.

**Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Roussi, moved approval of the application for 420 Douglas regarding placement of the neighborhood watch sign at this address. The Historic Preservation Coordinator shall have the authority to review and approve other requests for neighborhood watch signs in the Stuart Neighborhood. With a roll call vote, the motion carried with six ayes and one abstention. Mr. Bonsignore abstained from voting.**

**F. 504 Stuart (Case #: IHA 10-0246)**

No one was present to represent the property and the HDC moved to the next agenda item.

**G. 720 McCourtie (Case #: IHV 10-0013)**

Melanie Cadwallader, owner, was present to represent the property. The application requests retroactive approval of the replacement front door.

Ms. Cadwallader advised that she was present on behalf of her daughter Lindsey. The applicants didn't realize the house was in a historic district at the time they purchased the property. The door that was on the house was infested with bugs; a picture of the replacement door was provided to the HDC. Ms. Cadwallader advised that there are 11 doors on the block that look like the replacement door used at this address.

Ms. Ferraro advised that the door the applicants removed dated back to the 1930's. Ms. Cadwallader stated that it was a wooden door; they didn't replace the trim and they saved the old door knocker.

Mr. Tribu inquired if the replacement door conforms to historic district standards. Ms. Ferraro stated that the question pertains to having a metal door versus a wooden door. Also, the new door was installed without permission.

Mr. Nave inquired if the guardrail would be taken down. Ms. Cadwallader advised that it already has been taken down. This used to be a rental; the second mailbox was not removed.

Ms. Seaverson inquired about the type of door that Ms. Ferraro referred to, which had been cited in the past. Ms. Ferraro advised that there is a common, old-fashioned-looking door, that is available. The door is metal with a half-circle, fan light window, which is normally just applied to the surface of the door. The door that was removed was an original door from the 1930's or 1940's and separate pieces of glass were set into the

wood frame. The applicants could have put in a door with a half-circle light and that would have been appropriate because it now has its own historic integrity.

Mr. Nave stated that he didn't like the metal door on the front of the house. In the past, the HDC has approved metal doors for side and back entrances. Ms. Seaverson commented that the standards state that the front door should be made of wood, and it should be of an appropriate design.

**Ms. Seaverson, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved to deny the application for 720 McCourtie regarding replacement of the front door with a metal door. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

Discussion followed with regard to acceptable alternatives for replacing the existing door. Ms. Seaverson advised that it would not be acceptable to install a fiber glass door that looked like a wood door. The door the applicants installed would not likely have been approved by the HDC. Ms. Ferraro stated that Menards carries a wooden door with a half circle fan window, which is similar in appearance to the deteriorated door that was removed.

Ms. Cadwallader mentioned that other houses on that street have front doors similar to the one she installed. Ms. Seaverson advised that those doors may have been installed prior to the time those properties became part of the historic district. Ms. Cadwallader commented that she was unaware that the house was in the historic district when she purchased it. For security reasons, she would prefer to have a door with no window. She inquired if she could install a historic screen door over the existing door. Mr. Roussi commented that the applicants are in violation of standard #6, which states that deteriorated features, when replaced, shall match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. In this instance, it is possible to get a matching door.

Mr. Cinabro inquired if the HDC ever approved a front door like the one the applicants installed. Ms. Ferraro advised that one of the most common violations is for doors replaced without approval. Frequently, security reasons are cited for replacing an existing door. A new door is not necessarily more secure than an old door; a door is only as strong as its frame. She stated that, to her knowledge, the HDC has never approved a metal door for use on the front of a house in the historic district, unless the house/building is non-contributing. She advised that she would send a letter to the applicants advising them of their rights to appeal. She offered to meet with the applicants to discuss a replacement door.

**F. 504 Stuart (Case #: IHA 10-0246)**

No one was present to represent this property. Ms. Ferraro suggested that review of this application be postponed until next month.

**Ms. Seaverson, supported by Mr. Cinabro, moved to postpone review of the application for 504 Stuart until next month.**

Mr. Bonsignore inquired as to what would happen if the HDC didn't meet in September. Ms. Ferraro advised that the application could be denied at the August meeting. If the decision regarding 504 Stuart is postponed, that agenda item would be automatically transferred to the September HDC agenda. If action is not taken in 60 days, the application would be automatically approved. A motion to postpone until the next meeting would be considered as taking action on the application.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if the same application could be submitted if the HDC denied the current application. Ms. Ferraro advised that the application could be resubmitted with slight revisions.

Mr. Nave commented that the sill on the little window by the roof could be raised with a new window, and it would probably be less expensive than raising the whole window which would need a new header. The owner could install a single window rather than a double-hung window.

Mr. Cinabro inquired if it would be possible to set a time limit and provide notice to the applicant. Ms. Ferraro advised that she would send him a letter regarding the postponement. The letter can state that if no one attends the meeting to represent the property, the HDC can make a decision regarding the application. So far, three applications have been submitted for next month's meeting, which is scheduled for September 21<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Roussi stated that he would not be at the September HDC meeting.

Mr. Bonsignore stated that he would be voting against the motion because he thought the HDC should either deny or approve the application at this point.

**Ms. Seaverson, supported by Mr. Cinabro, withdrew the motion to postpone regarding 504 Stuart.**

**Mr. Roussi, supported by Mr. Nave, moved to deny the application for 504 Stuart. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Bonsignore advised that he would like to see more details regarding the window the applicant is proposing to install. Mr. Tribu inquired if the applicant would vent the room since it is a bathroom. Ms. Ferraro advised that this house is an empty rental. Mr. Bonsignore advised that many of the sills are rotting. He suggested that the applicant come to the HDC with a full plan for dealing with all of the windows.

**Presentation regarding 527 and 531 Eleanor**

Ms. Ferraro introduced Jeff Chamberlain, Director of Community Planning and Development, to provide the presentation.

Mr. Chamberlain provided a hand out to the HDC regarding the update on 531 Eleanor. City staff has been involved with this matter since 2003. The Planning Commission, Historic District Commission, State of Michigan, City Attorney's office, Mr. Chamberlain and Ms. Ferraro have been working with the Catholic Diocese regarding this matter.

Mr. Chamberlain advised that 527 and 531 Eleanor are in the Stuart Neighborhood. They are located south of Michikal, behind St. Augustine Cathedral. There was a fire at 531 Eleanor on September 8, 1996. The church acquired the property in 2003. In May 2003 the church presented a proposal to move the Ark (the church's facility for troubled youth) to the Eleanor Street property. That proposal involved remodeling and connecting the the house at 527 and 531 Eleanor for use as part of the Ark facility. The church presented their request to the Planning Commission for a special use permit. The Planning Commission approved the request. The HDC later denied the request. The diocese appealed the HDC's decision at the state level; the state upheld the HDC's decision.

The Anti-blight team sited the properties for blight, and the DBB ordered the church to make repairs. The church put the properties up for sale and obtained a repair estimate. The estimate was multiple times the value of the property. City staff also obtained a repair estimate for the properties. That estimate was not as high as the estimate the church received, but it was higher than the property value. The church again requested permission to proceed with demolition of 531 Eleanor St., with a request for a prayer garden on the site. The HDC denied that request in 2006 and the decision was upheld on appeal to the State Historic Preservation Review Board.

The city has been working with the diocese to reach a settlement. The settlement states that the Roman Catholic Diocese would renovate the house at 527 Eleanor Street and then demolish the house at 531 Eleanor. The house at 249 Cooley, slated for demolition when the site is developed for the event center, could be moved to the empty lot at 531 Eleanor. The Cooley Street house would be donated to the Roman Catholic Diocese and then moved to the vacant lot at 531 Eleanor Street.

To assist with the project costs, the city would contribute federal affordable housing dollars; \$45,000 in HOME and \$15,000 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. The house at 531 Eleanor Street would be used as an affordable housing unit. The house at 527 Eleanor would be used for church purposes. This would be the settlement between the city and the Roman Catholic Diocese. There would be no need for approvals from the Planning Commission, the Zoning Board of Appeals, or the

Historic District Commission Minutes

August 17, 2010

Page 11 of 14

Historic District Commission. The settlement would be presented to the City Commission for final approval. The catholic diocese has signed the agreement, which was drafted by city attorneys and attorneys for the diocese.

Mr. Chamberlain advised that a goal of the settlement was to try and preserve the integrity of the historic district, and to get the two remaining houses into productive use. The Cooley house would be saved.

Mr. Nave inquired if the Cooley house would become part of the historic district; Ms. Ferraro responded in the affirmative. The historic district is defined by the boundary description. Once the house is within that boundary, it becomes part of the historic district. Mr. Nave inquired if the HDC would review the reconstruction of the house. Mr. Chamberlain advised that the settlement agreement states that Ms. Ferraro would review the architectural details, the building plans and the moving plan. Ms. Ferraro stated that the house on Cooley Street is very sound. Up until the family moved out of it, it was a certified rental property; it does have vinyl siding. Mr. Nave advised that the foundation wall should look historic. Ms. Ferraro stated that the Cooley house should reflect the fact that it was moved from another location. A split-face block could be used rather than a plain block. Mr. Nave advised that the arrangement of porches should remain as is.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if the Cooley St. house would be considered a contributing resource to the historic district. It is an older home but it is not original to the district. Ms. Ferraro advised that she would speak with Amy Arnold at the State Historic Preservation Office regarding that question. She thinks it will be considered a contributing structure.

Mr. Bonsignore stated that he is on the SARA (Stuart Area Restoration Association) board, and that board would have liked to have been informed about what was happening with these properties.

Ms. Ferraro inquired if the language in the agreement stating that no further approval by the HDC will be required refers only to the relocation of the house and the settlement. After that time, the buildings would be subject to HDC approval like any other building in the Historic District. Mr. Chamberlain advised that he would have to look into that. He was uncertain as to the wording in the final version of the settlement.

Ms. Seaverson stated that she also had reservations with regard to the HDC having no further approval. Details pertaining to moving the house should come before the HDC. The HDC is a citizen board; the members of this board are under no pressure to acquiesce to unreasonable changes. She commented that she is thankful for city staff, but they have jobs to keep and pressure from superiors. The HDC is not subject to that pressure and would be in a better position to maintain the historic integrity of those structures. Mr. Nave inquired if renovations on 527 Eleanor would come before the HDC. Ms. Ferraro advised that they would if the proposed changes were for the exterior of the house. Mr. Bonsignore commented that the agreement states that no further approvals

Historic District Commission Minutes

August 17, 2010

Page 12 of 14

will be needed from the HDC. Mr. Chamberlain stated that with regard to the move, the renovation and the re-occupancy of the two homes, that was the intent. With regard to what goes on five years from now, that question has not been addressed.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the goal of city staff is to have the HDC endorse the proposed resolution. The resolution is not perfect but, as a structured settlement, it is also not precedent setting. He offered to meet with members of the HDC to answer questions.

Ms. DeYoung commented that the HDC would have no jurisdiction over the Cooley house once it is moved into the historic district. Mr. Chamberlain indicated that statement was not correct because the house would be in the historic district. Mr. Bonsignore advised that is not what the agreement says. This point needs clarification. The agreement states that the Roman Catholic Diocese will require no further approvals. Ms. DeYoung expressed concern that proceeding with the agreement would set a dangerous precedent.

Mr. Chamberlain commented that there are questions regarding how late in the year the move can be made. They are still hoping to complete the move during the current construction season.

Discussion followed with regard to what would happen five years from now if the church wanted to make changes to the house. Mr. Chamberlain stated that he would look into that. Ms. DeYoung commented that the HDC should be ruling on everything the church wants to do to the exterior of the house. Mr. Chamberlain advised that is part of the settlement, which addresses the situation from a different perspective.

Mr. Tribu commented that if the judge rules in favor of the church, they could demolish other houses. Mr. Chamberlain stated that the church has only requested one demolition. Mr. Tribu expressed concern that the church could change their request. Ms. Seaverson inquired as to the worst-case scenario; they could do anything they want? Mr. Chamberlain stated that they would look at the last request regarding the prayer garden.

Mr. Chamberlain advised that he would look into finding answers to the questions that have arisen. These houses need to be put back into use so this situation can move forward. Mr. Chamberlain advised that he would provide the HDC with more details.

Mr. Cinabro inquired if Ms. Ferraro would have control. If she says no, what happens? Ms. Seaverson inquired as to the worst-case scenario and what would be lost?

Mr. Chamberlain introduced City Attorney Clyde Robinson to provide further details.

Ms. Ferraro stated that the church bought the Eleanor Street properties in January of 2003. They submitted their first application in May of 2003. The church has cooperated with regard to keeping the houses closed to casual entry. They have also kept the trash

off the back porch, etc. They have not allowed the properties to become substantially worse.

Ms. Ferraro advised that this matter will be on the HDC agenda next month. Mr. Chamberlain stated that he would present options at the next meeting. Mr. Roussi requested that the HDC be provided with a copy of the agreement in case there are further questions.

Ms. Ferraro mentioned that the timeline for approvals would bring this matter into October. It would take at least a month to make arrangements to move the house, which would likely mean that the Cooley St. house could not be moved until spring.

#### **IX. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 18<sup>th</sup> and July 20<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

##### **May 18, 2010 Minutes**

There were no changes to the May 18, 2010 HDC minutes.

**Mr. Cinabro, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved approval of the May 18, 2010 HDC minutes as amended. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

##### **July 20, 2010 Minutes**

Mr. Bonsignore referred to page 4, paragraph 2, the steel and concrete bollards were installed during the applicant's ownership of the property over the past 14 years, not the past year. Page 5, paragraph 2, Ms. Eckert installed bollards not blocks.

**Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Cinabro, moved approval of the July 20, 2010 HDC minutes as amended. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

#### **XII. OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Bonsignore referred to the house at 504 Douglas. Ms. Ferraro stated that the paint wouldn't stay on the outside of the house, possibly due to the re-plastering on the inside. If the paint is falling off that wall and not the others, the siding may not be the issue. The owner wanted to do all four sides. Four or five years ago the paint wouldn't stick. Ms. Ferraro was uncertain if the owner had tried to repaint the house since then.

(7:25 p.m. – Mr. Cinabro left the meeting.)

Mr. Bonsignore advised that certain types of paint don't and are likely to pull off the primer. The siding is o.k., it just needs paint. Mr. Nave advised that the house needs oil primer and two layers of latex paint. She is changing out original material and needs HDC approval.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**Ms. DeYoung, supported by Mr. Roussi, moved to adjourn the August 17, 2010 meeting of the Historic District Commission. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

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

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

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