

**City of Kalamazoo
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES
May 18, 2010
DRAFT**

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

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

City Staff: Sharon Ferraro, Historic Preservation Coordinator; John Kneas,
Assistant City Attorney; 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

Ms. Ferraro requested the addition of a discussion at the end of the agenda regarding 430 W. Walnut.

Mr. Bonsignore requested the addition of a discussion at the end of the agenda regarding solar panels that were approved last month.

Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Cinabro, moved approval of the May 18, 2010 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. Consideration of an amendment to the Standards and Guidelines to delegate review of NON-HISTORIC buildings in the Haymarket historic district to the Downtown Design Review Committee except for demolition. (Assistant City Attorney John Kneas)

Attorney Kneas advised that the request pertains to amending the guidelines, not the ordinance. The ordinance authorizes the HDC to establish design review guidelines, which become effective by the adoption of a resolution of the City Commission. The proposed amendment is attached to the agenda. The delegation is for all work except demolition. The additions and new construction would be under the purview of the Downtown Design Review Committee. Many of the standards of the Downtown Design Review Committee would take into account how the non-

City of Kalamazoo Historic District Commission Minutes

May 18, 2010

Page 2 of 16

historic buildings fit in with the overall façades and characteristics of the surrounding buildings. Many of the Downtown Design Review Guidelines would be a duplication of what the HDC would look for in a non-historic building for purposes of any type of regulation pertaining to exterior work. Since many of these processes would be a duplication of efforts, particularly for non-historic buildings, this amendment to the guidelines is being recommended. This may just be the first phase; Ms. Ferraro is looking at a more extensive amendment to the guidelines in the future. The next amendment will address the non-historic buildings in the other historic districts in the city.

(5:08 p.m. – Ms. DeYoung and Mr. Tribu arrived.)

Mr. Cinabro inquired if the wording of the amendment impacted only the Haymarket Historic District; Attorney Kneas confirmed that to be true. Mr. Cinabro mentioned that the HDC has the authority to approve this change under the State law. He inquired if there was anything that would contradict the state law/regulations. Attorney Kneas advised that there is nothing in the proposed amendment that would contradict the state law. He advised that the statute gives the HDC the authority to withdraw the delegation of review to another authority. In the past, the HDC has delegated authority to the Historic Preservation Coordinator to review and approve certain types of requests. The HDC could also choose to delegate authority to the building inspector or another authority. In the past, the City Commission, through the zoning ordinance, adopted the resolution and the guidelines which established the Downtown Design Review Guidelines.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired as to the boundaries that would be affected by the proposed amendment change. Attorney Kneas advised that the boundaries coincide generally with the Downtown Development Authority Boundary (DDA). Ms. Ferraro stated that the boundaries would extend from Kalamazoo Avenue to Cedar Street, the Kalamazoo River up to Westnedge, except a small portion that runs up to Academy Street, and then up to W. Michigan Ave.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired as to how much of that area was in the Historic District. Ms. Ferraro advised that only the Haymarket Historic District (the north side of E. Michigan from Kalamazoo Ave. to Edwards and the South side of E. Michigan from Portage to Pitcher) would be affected. The amendment to the guidelines would affect only the three non-historic buildings that are currently in the historic district. A fourth non-historic building would be affected when the proposed expansion to the Haymarket district is completed.

Mr. Bonsignore requested further details about the guidelines. Ms. Ferraro advised that the changes pertain to the standards and guidelines that the HDC uses. Ms. Ferraro is proposing a 3 ½ to 4 page change that details how the HDC would review non-historic buildings in any of the historic districts in light of the fact that there are no standards and guidelines for non-historic buildings. This will give owners of non-historic properties an idea of what is expected of them. The Downtown Design Review Committee (DDRC) Guidelines were written in 2007. The DDRC guidelines have much of the same text and drawings that are in the Historic District Guidelines for historic buildings. Existing buildings and new construction are the two major categories. For historic buildings outside of the historic district, it is expected that the historic character will be maintained. For non-historic buildings, there is more flexibility, and that will be taken into account in the context of the Haymarket Historic District.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if the proposed changes pertained to everything but new construction and demolition. Attorney Kneas advised that it pertains to everything but demolition. Ms. Seaverson

City of Kalamazoo Historic District Commission Minutes

May 18, 2010

Page 3 of 16

expressed concern that the public doesn't have any input regarding who serves on the DDRC. Ms. Ferraro stated that the DDRC members are appointed by the City Manager and the Director of DKI (Downtown Kalamazoo, Inc.). The composition of the DDRC board members is defined by the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Seaverson mentioned that there are guidelines and there are standards. The last time the HPC was involved with the DDRC regarding a project of historic significance, there were only guidelines and they couldn't be enforced. Ms. Ferraro advised that the process of revising the DDRC standards and guidelines is about 80% complete. It is very similar to the HDC standards; there will be some issues that are more specific and there will be other situations where there will be more flexibility.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if the HPC (Historic Preservation Commission) has been providing input with regard to the proposed changes; Ms. Ferraro responded in the affirmative and advised that the HPC would continue to provide input in this process. The changes to the standards and guidelines will likely be ready for approval this summer, but the amendment will be approved before that time. The amendment will allow the changes to proceed with the DDRC guidelines.

Attorney Kneas mentioned that if the DDRC guidelines change after this amendment is adopted, the changed guidelines will apply. Ms. Seaverson inquired if the new standards and guidelines would be approved by the time the proposed amendment takes effect. Ms. Ferraro indicated that the changes to the DDRC standards and guidelines will likely occur within four or five months. The draft versions of the documents are nearly completed, but the DDA, Planning Commission, and Zoning Board need to review and approve the amendments, which will then proceed to the City Commission for final approval. The approval process will likely be completed by early fall.

Ms. Ferraro advised that there are only four buildings included in the downtown local historic district that are non-historic or non-contributing. Two of the four buildings are old buildings that have been substantially rehabilitated; the other two buildings are new construction.

Mr. Roussi inquired as to how the proposed amendments to the guidelines would affect the verbiage in Chapter 16, Section 22 of the Kalamazoo City Ordinance that states that "The Kalamazoo Historic District Commission is empowered to regulate work on historic and non-historic resources." Attorney Kneas advised that the ordinance allows the HDC to delegate to city staff, building authorities or other delegated authorities as the basis for recommending these amendments. That language will remain in effect. The proposed changes won't impact the authority of the HDC over historic buildings in the historic district; the changes are limited to non-historic resources.

Mr. Cinabro, supported by Mr. Roussi, moved approval of the amended guidelines pertaining to non-historic buildings in historic districts. With a voice vote, the motion carried with five ayes, one abstention and one nay. Mr. Nave abstained, Mr. Bonsignore provided the nay vote.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. 405 Douglas (Case #: IHA 10-0062)

Owners Steve and Florence Denham were present to discuss the application. The application requests a single story addition to the west/rear side of the house.

Ms. Denham advised that her original application was for a deck to be constructed on the back of the house this year, and an addition to be added next year. The contractor is giving them a good price on the addition so they want to proceed with that this year. The new application is for the addition.

Mr. Nave advised that he and Ms. Ferraro visited the subject property. Mr. Nave made a sketch of the proposed addition. Ms. Ferraro stated that the addition was based on the similar roof pitch to the second story porch at the back. The applicants decided not to have a staircase leading out of the addition because without the staircase and door, there is more usable space inside.

Ms. Denham advised that she found period windows at the Heritage Company. She also found three matching stained glass windows to incorporate into the design. Mr. Bonsignore advised that part of the historic district standards dictate that you cannot create faux historic details. The addition should not blend perfectly with the original house. He inquired as to what details in the plan would accomplish that goal. Ms. Denham advised that she thought the addition was supposed to blend with the house. Ms. Ferraro advised that the addition should complement the house but not blend with it. For instance, the siding could be narrower or wider than the original house. Ms. Denham stated that the period stained glass windows in the addition will help accomplish that goal. There are four pieces of glass in the top of the windows and the bottom is one solid piece. The applicants are planning to put lattice around the bottom of the addition and that would help make it distinct.

Mr. Bonsignore mentioned that using wider siding would save money and help distinguish the addition from the original house. Ms. Ferraro advised that the reveal on the existing siding is four inches; she suggested using a five inch reveal on the siding for the addition.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if the stained glass would be installed in the center of the rear elevation. Ms. Denham responded in the affirmative and advised that there is one panel on each side. She found three stained glass windows that match. The side elevation will look like the rear elevation.

Ms. Seaverson advised that there is already wide and narrow siding on the house.

Ms. Seaverson, supported by Mr. Nave, moved approval of the addition on the back of 405 Douglas, as pictured. The siding on the addition should be wider than the siding on the original home. Three stained glass panels are to be installed in the addition rather than just one panel. Details to be approved by the Historic Preservation Coordinator. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

B. 125 South Prairie (Case #: IHA 10-0062)

Owner Karla Niehus was present to represent the property. The application requests the addition of a roofless porch to the rear/west entrance. The porch will include brick or stucco to match the house. This completes a door and window project from July 2009.

Ms. Niehus advised that the drawing doesn't show a railing but she intends to have a railing to code. She is undecided with regard to whether or not the porch should be totally roofless with brick or stucco piers, or if it should have squared, wooden pillars on top of the piers with a pergola roof. Time and money are factors in the decision-making process. The house is stucco with yellow brick piers on the corners and the front porch.

Mr. Nave inquired if the walls are stucco or rock. Ms. Niehus advised that area has not been fully thought out. She is considering putting stucco at the bottom. Mr. Nave commented that the stucco would cost more than the lattice. Ms. Niehus advised that she knows someone who can do the stucco work. Mr. Nave commented that the boards of the pergola roof would have to be away from the doors, unless they start at the gutter line above the door. He inquired as to what kind of columns go with this house. Ms. Ferraro suggested a battered, square column, slightly wider at the bottom than at the top, would be appropriate for this Craftsman-style house.

Ms. Seaverson commented that the roofless porch looks better with the style of the house. Mr. Tribu stated that he would be willing to approve either option. Mr. Nave mentioned that the brick columns would be more expensive than the wood columns. The HDC has allowed synthetic flooring such as Trex on rear porches similar to this. The rest of the wood should be Cypress (painted) or a similar wood.

Mr. Tribu inquired if the pergola should be free-standing or if it should be attached to the house. If the pergola is attached to the house, there may be issues with the window and the stucco. Mr. Nave advised that the columns could be set away from the house about four inches; the floor of the porch could be attached to the house.

Ms. Neihus confirmed that the porch would set on four columns if the porch was set out from the house far enough for the door to clear. The slope of the roof on the house would create problems if the pergola were under the roof. The porch structure would have to start out past the eaves.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired about the proposed patio. Ms. Neihus inquired if it would be preferable to do nothing at, or have a brick or wood patio/deck. Ms. Ferraro advised that the HDC doesn't rule on paving or landscaping. Mr. Bonsignore mentioned that if the wood deck/patio is attached to the other deck, then the HDC would rule on it. Ms. Neihus advised that she would probably use pavers. If wood is used, it would probably be a free-standing structure. Ms. Ferraro suggested getting approval for the floating deck at this point, in case the applicant decides to proceed with that in the future. The deck would be less than a foot off the ground so it would not require a rail. HDC approval for the deck would not require that the applicants have the deck constructed, but it would give them the option to do so if they chose.

The general consensus was that more information was needed from the applicant before a decision could be made. Mr. Nave advised that he is not in favor of the lower deck because it a modern feature. The HDC would not have jurisdiction over a patio. However, a "structure"

City of Kalamazoo Historic District Commission Minutes

May 18, 2010

Page 6 of 16

would require HDC approval. Ms. Ferraro added that if footings are required, HDC approval would be necessary. Ms. Seaverson agreed with Mr. Nave regarding his assessment of the deck. She suggested that the applicants decide which option they prefer and provide further details. Mr. Nave mentioned that a builder would need a detailed sketch in order to bid on the job. The HDC would like to see what the builder is bidding on. Ms. Neihus advised that the builder is usually her husband and a guy named Rick.

Mr. Bonsignore suggested that the following details be provided: what will the columns be constructed with, what are the proportions of the columns in relation to the rest of the deck, what decking material will be used, what will the pergola look like and how will it relate to the house.

Ms. Seaverson suggested working with Ms. Ferraro to come up with a plan that would be acceptable to the HDC. Mr. Nave advised that the city may require a drawing of the structure before they issue a permit. More details should be provided regarding the framing of the structure.

Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Tribu, moved approval in concept for the rear/west porch addition proposed for 125 South Prairie. Further details of the project are to be presented for approval at the June or July HDC meeting. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

C. 223 West Vine (IHA 10-0075)

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

D. 1525 Grand Avenue (IHA 10-0119)

Owners Raymond and Mary Seitz and contractor Chance Townsend were present to represent the property. The application requests replacement of the half-barrel clay tile roof with architectural shingles in a similar color.

Mr. Seitz advised that he and his wife would like to sell the house. The realtor advised that the leaking roof would need to be fixed. There are currently 20-25 buckets sitting in the attic to collect rain water. In the past, a couple of contractors have attempted to patch the tile roof, but it is still leaking. The repair work has cost several thousand dollars so far. Mr. Seitz provided a list of estimates that he distributed to the HDC. The first two pages are local contractors who install asphalt shingles. It would cost approximately \$14,000 to install asphalt shingles with a 30-year warranty. Bill's Roofing repair from Cassopolis does tile roof repair. He advised that the tiles need to be removed and either replaced with new tiles or the old ones should be put back on. Underlayment should be installed to seal the roof before the tiles are installed. The estimate to repair the roof and replace the tiles was over \$42,000. The estimate to repair the roof and reuse as much of the old tiles as possible was approximately \$28,000.

Mr. Seitz advised that he also investigated the possibility of installing a metal roof. The estimate for the Addis steel, shake or shingle tile was an additional \$17,000 above the \$13,000 estimate shown on the handout. For a total of approximately \$26,000.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if the estimate was for a tile metal roof or a standing seam metal roof. Ms. Ferraro advised that the estimate was for a metal roof made to look like shake or slate shingles.

City of Kalamazoo Historic District Commission Minutes

May 18, 2010

Page 7 of 16

The fifth sheet refers to a website regarding American Metal Roofs. Mr. Seitz read the following excerpt from the materials provided: "Terra Tile is popular among residential applications in southern states where expansion and contraction are not as big a concern. Because of its exposed fasteners, great care should be observed when installing in northern climates." Mr. Seitz commented that this statement implies that Terra Tile might not be the best roofing option in Michigan. Ms. Ferraro pointed out that the information regarding Terra Tile also mentions that it resists snow and ice. She mentioned the metal roof to the applicants because Robb MacKay at the State Historic Preservation Office mentioned that the Terra Tile is one type of metal replacement roofing that has been approved for tax credit projects. It very closely replicates the appearance of clay tile roof. The tax credit is 25%. The applicants will be moving so they would not be able to take advantage of the tax credit and it is not transferable.

Mr. Nave inquired if the applicants had looked at other types of shingles that are similar in appearance. Mrs. Seitz stated that she reviewed information about the concrete shingles, which indicated that the color is likely to fade in about ten years.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if anyone is still making the asphalt shingles that look like clay tile. Ms. Ferraro advised that the half-barrel type asphalt shingles are no longer available, but they make some that lay flat. Mr. Bonsignore referred to a house on Bronson Blvd. that has a roof made from material that looks like clay tile. Ms. Ferraro was uncertain if that product was still available.

Mr. Bonsignore advised the applicants that the clay tile roof on their house is an important architectural detail. The roof is highly visible due to the way it is situated on the hill. Mr. Nave concurred and commented that the subject property is one of the most important houses in the neighborhood.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if any work would need to be done on the deck. Mr. Seitz advised that the estimate included possible wood replacement to the decking at an additional charge.

Ms. Ferraro referred to the bid from Bill's Roof Repair, which included removal and reuse of the original tile, re-decking and re-flashing. He said he couldn't warranty the work when he was done. Mrs. Seitz clarified that he couldn't warranty that the roof wouldn't leak if he reused the existing tiles. He has worked on clay tile roof but he hasn't worked on the Seitz's house. Ms. Ferraro inquired if there is decking on the house now. Mr. Townsend advised that the decking is solid 1 x 12. There are perlins on top of the 1 x 12's.

Mr. Cinabro inquired as to what the applicants are asking the HDC to approve. Mr. Seitz advised that the request is for asphalt shingles with a 30-year warranty, in a color close to that of the original tiles. A contractor has not been chosen yet. The shingles would not be a barrel configuration.

Ms. Ferraro advised that the garage matches the house and also has the Ludowici roof tiles. This is the only roof the house/garage has had. Mr. Nave stated that the Ludowici tile company is still in business.

Ms. Seitz inquired if the historic tax credit would be prorated if the homeowner were to move within five years after the tax credit is obtained, or if the homeowner would be required to repay the tax credit. Ms. Ferraro confirmed that it would be prorated. The tax credit would not be

City of Kalamazoo Historic District Commission Minutes

May 18, 2010

Page 8 of 16

available for the asphalt roof the applicants are proposing; it would only be available if they put back the clay tiles or install similar ones. If it took three or four years for the house to sell, the owners would only have to pay back 20% or 40% of the tax credit, not the full amount. The tax credit would reduce the expenditure by 25%; it would be a direct credit against the owners' Michigan income tax.

Ms. Seaverson commented that the tile roof is a key architectural feature and she was not in favor of the application. Ms. Seitz advised that she and her husband have already spent thousands of dollars on repairs that have not prevented the roof from leaking. She expressed concern about how much more money they would be required to invest in the roof. Ms. Seaverson commented that having a home of this stature does require a certain level of responsibility. The applicants advised that the house was not part of the historic district when they purchased it. Mrs. Seitz stated that they don't have \$40,000 to spend on a new tile roof.

Mr. Bonsignore advised that he would not be in favor of the asphalt roof the applicants are proposing to use. The purpose of the HDC is to help protect the historic nature of the various historic districts in the City of Kalamazoo. The proposed roof would be counter to the purpose of the HDC.

Mr. Roussi advised that the HDC is compelled by the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation to follow the guidelines. The guidelines state that deteriorated features need to be repaired rather than replaced.

Mrs. Seitz inquired as to what constitutes historic significance. A group of people voted to make the area a historic district; the house isn't even 100 years old. She inquired as to why the house is historically significant at this point. The house has cost a substantial amount in taxes and utilities and now the applicants are being told they need to invest another \$28,000 to \$40,000 in the roof. The house was not in the historic district when the applicants purchased it, and they are concerned about when and how the expenses will end. They are concerned about how they will continue to live there or if they can even sell the house.

Mr. Nave suggested that the house could be sold as is, with the understanding that the buyers will have to deal with the roof. Ms. Seitz advised that they were told by the realtor that they would have to put a new roof on the house before they put it on the market. Mr. Nave pointed out that the realtor is trying to make a fee on the house. Mr. Nave stated that he has sold two houses as is in the applicants' neighborhood. It is a desirable neighborhood. Ms. Ferraro pointed out that the next owner could use the historic tax credit to help restore the roof.

Ms. Seaverson, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved to deny the application for 1525 Grand Avenue, based on Secretary of the Interiors Standards and Guidelines #2, which states that the historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. Removal of distinctive materials or alteration of those materials will be avoided. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Cinabro stated that he and other members of the HDC are sympathetic with the financial issues the applicants are facing. He advised that the HDC is constrained by a mandate (Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines). The subject property is a beautiful home that sits in a very prominent location and the roof is a very distinctive feature. He suggested continuing to work with the Historic Preservation Coordinator to find a compromise.

City of Kalamazoo Historic District Commission Minutes

May 18, 2010

Page 9 of 16

Mr. Nave advised that green cement Spanish-style shingles were used on Bell's Brewery downtown. From the street, the tiles appear the same as the original tiles. The sales representative also showed samples of a synthetic shingle that was similar in appearance. Ms. Ferraro suggested that the samples were of Vande Hey tiles. Those tiles have a tendency to delaminate; they are made out of a recycled material. Mr. Nave advised that the cement shingles are from the same company that provided the roofing for the Amtrak station; those shingles have been in place since the 1970's.

Mr. Townsend mentioned that the materials being discussed could cost between \$88 per square foot and \$1,000 per square foot and up. The roof on the subject property dates back to 1920. If the builders had installed a standard hand-split, shake roof at the time, it would have likely been replaced by an asphalt roof at some point in the 1960's, and there would have been no need for the current discussion. It is important to come up with a solution to support the longevity of the building and maintain its historical nature in the community. From a contractor's standpoint it is difficult to warranty the existing 80-year-old tiles, and a large quantity of them may be lost in the tear-off and replacement process. According to the written estimates, it would cost \$26,000 minimum to repair the roof and reuse the existing tiles, but there would be no warranty. If the warranty may be good for the lifetime of the tile, but the lifetime of the tile is up.

Mr. Nave suggested speaking with the sales representative who sells the concrete tiles to discuss possible options. Mr. Nave suggested that the owners not hire a contractor who hasn't already done this type of tile work. The contractor should be able to guarantee that his work won't leak when it is finished.

Discussion followed with regard to the house on Bronson Blvd. that has an example of a tile roof. No one was certain of the address. Ms. Seaverson commented that installing a new roof with underlayment is different than patching the old tile roof. The underlayment will provide the weather barrier. She suggested that having a new roof installed by an experienced contractor would be a better option. Mr. Seitz advised that the contractor in Grand Rapids was experienced with repairing tiles roofs. He already has too much work and cannot take on another project. The applicants have been unable to find a contractor in Kalamazoo who is experienced with tile roof repair/replacement.

Mr. Tribu commented that repair or reuse of the original roof is not necessarily the best option. There may be something similar to the original roof that would be appropriate. He suggested that the applicants continue to explore options other than the asphalt shingles.

Discussion followed with regard to the expense of repair/replacement of the existing roof. Mr. Nave mentioned that if someone wanted to reproduce the Seitz's house today, it would cost approximately \$300 to \$350 per square foot to reproduce it. The price the applicants have been quoted is about \$25 per square foot, which makes sense with today's price for the house. The applicants advised that no one would likely reproduce their house with the tile roof due to the winter climate in this area. Ms. Ferraro mentioned that similar tile roofs can be found in Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Finland, etc. That type of roof can handle the cold weather and has for hundreds of years. It isn't common in this area because it is more expensive. Ms. Ferraro referred to houses in the Detroit and Chicago areas that have more complex tile roofs, which have not leaked since the repairs were made several years ago. If the contractor properly installs the underlayment, the ice and water shield and the appropriate flashing, the roof should not leak. Ms. Seitz advised that she would not be installing a \$40,000 roof.

Ms. Seaverson suggested contacting a couple of different realtors to find a buyer who appreciates the historic value of the house and is willing to make the investment. The buyer would be able to take advantage of historic tax credit for the appropriate repair/replacement of the roof.

Mr. Roussi suggested that Standard #6 applies in this case. He inquired if Ms. Seaverson would be willing to amend the motion to quote Standards #2 and #6. Ms. Seaverson agreed to add Standard #6 to the motion, which reads as follows: "Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of the deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials."

The motion to deny the application for shake shingles at 1525 Grand Avenue was amended to include Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines number 6. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Ferraro advised that she would be providing the applicants with a letter detailing the discussion that took place at the meeting and the subsequent decision regarding the application. The letter will also include information about the applicants' right to appeal the decision. Ms. Ferraro encouraged the applicants to contact her if they had any questions.

Mrs. Seitz commented that it was a pleasure working with Ms. Ferraro regarding this application.

E. 415 Stanwood (Case #: IHA 10-0120)

Owner Bill Watson was present to represent the property. The application requests replacement of the small front entry stoop with slightly larger deck and steps.

Mr. Watson advised that he would like to have a new porch built; the existing boards are rotting. A few repairs were done last year when the addition was done. Other issues with the house are being addressed at this point, and the porch is one of the first things they would like to take care of. The applicant has 2 x 6 Cedar decking for the front of the house. Ms. Ferraro advised that there is a question about using the 5/4 versus the 2 x 6 decking; the applicant is seeking clarification regarding those details.

Ms. Ferraro advised that the new deck will be a little wider than the original entry stoop. She didn't want to change that proportion without input from the HDC. Mr. Watson advised that the proposed deck would be about a foot and a half wider on each side. The projection away from the house is about the same. He would like to make the porch as wide as the vestibule so there will be more room for everyone to get onto the flat platform of the porch before they try to open the door. Right now, that isn't possible if you have something in your arms.

Mr. Nave inquired as to how high the porch is off the ground; Mr. Watson estimated that the total distance is about 40". The current porch comes out at the door sill. Mr. Watson is proposing to have the porch down one rise before starting the platform. Mr. Nave commented that if the porch is higher than 30", the code will require a handrail. Mr. Watson advised that he has a drawing that shows a handrail. In the revised version that was faxed to Ms. Ferraro, the handrail was inadvertently omitted. Mr. Ferraro mentioned that the metal awning in the picture is also gone.

Mr. Nave mentioned that the HDC has approved 3/4" decking. Ms. Ferraro advised that currently decking is closer to 7/8" rather than 5/4". Mr. Watson advised that he had not planned on using

City of Kalamazoo Historic District Commission Minutes

May 18, 2010

Page 11 of 16

tongue and groove decking; he would prefer to use something that would provide better drainage. The porch is uncovered and there should be some clarification as to what type of decking is used.

Mr. Bonsignore advised that porches would generally have a tongue and groove decking. The decking would need to be sloped appropriately so that the water runs off. The framing should be parallel to the house rather than perpendicular. The deck boards need to be perpendicular to the house so that water doesn't collect in the gaps. Pre-finishing all of the boards on all surfaces is also important to prevent deterioration. Mr. Nave suggested using oil primer. Ms. Ferraro advised that oil primer should not be used on friction surfaces (walking surfaces on the porch deck and steps.). The formula to use is three parts paint to one part thinner of the porch floor paint. That formula should be used as primer on all sides. Another undiluted coat should be used as the final surface. Otherwise, the primer tends to be too soft and it wears through.

Ms. Watson inquired as to which deck boards will be allowed. If the tongue and groove is required, it will probably be limited to a 1 x. He advised that he is not familiar with a tongue and groove product that is a 2 x or a 5/4 that is tongue and groove. Mr. Nave advised that tongue and groove deck boards would be allowed on the front. Ms. Ferraro stated that the Woodsmiths on 9th Street can run Cypress tongue and groove. It is moisture resistant and will last a long time. A property owner on Bellevue did a full width front porch with that product about nine years ago and it is wearing well. The Cypress will cost more but it is more durable than the Cedar. Mr. Watson advised that he wanted to use the 2 x because he thought it would be more durable and wear better with high traffic. Ms. Ferraro advised that the supplier will run 5/4 decking, which will be only slightly thinner than a 2 x and would be the same thickness as the original porch.

Mr. Nave advised that the slope should be at 1/4" per foot, which would be the same slope used for sidewalks and flat roofs. Mr. Watson expressed concern about the tongue and groove product collecting water. Ms. Ferraro advised that there are open porches and closed porches with tongue and groove decking that have been in place for 80 years or more.

Mr. Nave suggested using a mat that breathes so that the wood underneath doesn't deteriorate. Mr. Watson advised that he would make that adjustment in the plan.

Mr. Nave, supported by Ms. Seaverson, moved approval of the new sketch showing the railings and porch to historic district standards, with the tongue and groove 1 x or 5/4" sloped floor boards, Cedar or Cypress, with the dimensions of the porch (4' x 8') as shown in the sketch. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

F. 146 Prairie (Case #: IHA 10-0121)

Owner Jennifer Hall was present to represent the property. The application requests a rear addition with mudroom and bathroom.

Ms. Hall e-mailed an updated drawing to Ms. Ferraro, which she distributed to the HDC.

Mr. Tribu inquired if the windows were inadvertently omitted in the revised drawing; Ms. Hall responded in the affirmative. The two windows will remain in place.

The contractor who provided the drawing was present. He advised that he is trying to provide a roof pitch that will achieve the necessary drainage. The window (the larger one that shows up on

City of Kalamazoo Historic District Commission Minutes

May 18, 2010

Page 12 of 16

the drawing) may need to be shortened in order to get the correct roof pitch. It does not appear to be the egress window for the bedroom. The windows are not original to the house.

Mr. Nave inquired if the bump in the middle of the elbow was an addition for a bathroom. Ms. Hall confirmed that there is a bathroom in that location. Mr. Nave mentioned that addition only extends out a couple of feet and it also has a sloped roof. The contractor advised that he was trying to duplicate the roofline about the bathroom addition. Mr. Nave suggested adding flashing under the bedroom window sill before starting the roof. The contractor advised that once he determines the dimensions of the roof and where it will fit, he can make a determination as to whether the window will need to be shortened in order to install enough flashing.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if the back wall of the addition would be in line with the back wall of the house; Ms. Hall responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Nave requested further details regarding the steps. Ms. Hall advised that a final decision had not been made in that regard. She is considering having two concrete steps in a rounded semi-circle. Mr. Nave advised that the suggested configuration would not be high enough to require a railing. Ms. Ferraro confirmed that to be correct and advised that there are only two steps on the house currently.

Ms. Seaverson inquired as to the proposed roofing material. The contractor advised that the existing roofing material is Sheriff Goslin; he requested a roofing material similar to that. The deck would be completely removed. If a handrail is required, Ms. Ferraro would approve that administratively. The vinyl siding to be installed will not match exactly, but will complement the existing siding.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if the replacement windows would be wood or vinyl. The contractor advised that a decision had not been made in that regard. Ms. Hall stated that all of the windows on the bottom floor are vinyl replacement windows. The contractor advised that the replacement windows are wrapped with aluminum and the frieze board is wrapped with aluminum. He could do vinyl or clad to match the existing windows. Mr. Bonsignore verified that by "frieze board" the contractor meant the exterior casing.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired as to the general consensus about matching the width of the trim on the addition to what's currently on the house. Mr. Nave concurred that the trim should be matched, especially on the upstairs. Ms. Seaverson mentioned that the existing windows are metal wrapped and questioned if matching them would be appropriate. Ms. Hall advised that only the windows in the sunroom are original; all of the windows have been wrapped with the same material on the outside. The contractor expressed concern regarding the space. If it is too wide, the windows would have to be spread out and the space would be less usable. He is proposing to use a steel door similar to the one that is already there.

Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Roussi, moved to accept the application for 146 Prairie. The vinyl siding is to line up with the existing vinyl siding. The trim should match wrapped trim in size and shape. The roof fascia board edges should match the rest of the house, at least the back addition. Dimensions of the overhang and the rake should match. Any vinyl trim in the gable should run up to match the second floor, back wing. The windows should be wood with aluminum cladding. The gutters, downspouts and roofing should match the original. Steps and railings, if needed, are to be approved by the Historic Preservation Coordinator. If the window is altered on the second floor, the trim should match what is

below. The door should either be approved by the coordinator or the old door should be reused. The muntins should match the other muntins in the house to the south/back wing.

Discussion followed with regard to the siding. Ms. Hall advised that the siding is vinyl, the house used to be stucco. Ms. Hall stated that the muntins on the replacement windows are between the panes of glass. Ms. Ferraro advised that the house is not altered enough to be considered non-contributing. Mr. Bonsignore mentioned that the proposed addition will be in keeping with the alterations.

Discussion followed with regard to the foundation. The contractor advised that there has been a considerable amount of water coming off the roof and going through the deck. The deck was built over the stairs to the basement. The contractor would like to install a concrete foundation crawl space and block that wall up. He is trying to make sure the existing door to the basement is water tight. There is a row of brick in the foundation. Mr. Nave suggested a concrete foundation stained to match the brick.

In response to a question from Ms. Seaverson, Ms. Ferraro confirmed that the subject property has not been altered enough to be considered non-contributing. The essential character, shape, configuration are still intact. Ms. Seaverson stated that she would prefer that wood siding be used on the addition in case someone decides to remove the vinyl siding from the rest of the house at some point in the future. Ms. Ferraro inquired if the original stucco was still under the vinyl siding; Ms. Hall was uncertain if the stucco was still there. Ms. Ferraro commented that the way the window casings look is in an indicator that the stucco is no longer there. She suggested that Hardie Board could be used. Mr. Tribu commented that he didn't see the sense to having the added expense of Hardie Board on the rear addition. If someone wants to remove the siding in the future, it would be just as easy to take off the vinyl siding as it would be to remove the Hardie Board.

With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

C. 223 W. Vine (Case #: IHA 10-0075)

No one was present to represent the property. The application states that the fascia on the house and porch were wrapped in metal, the soffit was repaired with metal, the porch deck was overlaid with plywood and painted. The base of the corner porch columns was wrapped with 1" wood.

The applicant was not present. Some of the HDC members advised that they were not comfortable ruling on this matter. Ms. Ferraro advised that this property is owned by Commerce Real Estate and this property is one of their more recent acquisitions; it was purchased about a year ago. Ms. Ferraro met with their maintenance person at that time to discuss some things that needed to be done. Since that time, they have hired a different maintenance person who made changes that were different than what was discussed originally and no applications were made to do any of the work. The wrapping of the fascia and the soffits, the deck put on the porch without repairing the underlying joists, and the wrapping of the base of the columns were the three problems that Ms. Ferraro cited. This is a retroactive review.

Mr. Bonsignore advised that the work was not done very nicely. For instance, the fascia was only wrapped in some places. Ms. Ferraro inquired as to whether or not the application would have been approved if it had been submitted in advance. The general consensus was that it would not have been approved under those circumstances.

Mr. Cinabro inquired as to what would happen if the application were denied. Ms. Ferraro stated that the applicant would have to request approval from Ms. Ferraro for correctly completing the repairs, or they would have to come back to the HDC with a different plan. Ms. Ferraro would require that the applicants remove the wrapping and repair the damaged wood with like material, rebuild the two damaged columns, and remove the plywood from the porch and repair and replace the decking as needed.

Mr. Cinabro inquired if there have been problems with Commerce Real Estate on other properties in the historic district; Ms. Ferraro responded in the affirmative. They are fully aware that the property is located in the historic district.

Mr. Nave moved to deny the application regarding 223 W. Vine. The work should be redone to historic district standards.

Mr. Nave inquired as to what would happen if the work was not completed. Ms. Ferraro suggested adding a timeline to the motion for the violation remedy. For instance, if the work is not completed within 60 day, it would proceed through the violation process. It would then be turned over to the anti-blight team and they could begin enforcement proceedings against the applicants. Sixty days is the typical timeline for this type of situation. Discussion followed with regard to problems with the repairs.

Mr. Cinabro commented that the applicants proceeded with the work without approval, they did a sloppy job and there is no one present to represent the applicants. Ms. Ferraro advised that she notified the property manager and the company who owns the property separately. Ms. Ferraro advised that she met with them and discussed solution to issues they had. Housing Inspector Dan DeCamp caught the problems and brought them to Ms. Ferraro's attention.

Mr. Nave withdrew his motion.

Ms. Seaverson, supported by Mr. Tribu, moved to deny the application for 223 W. Vine. The work does not comply with the historic district guidelines. The problems are to be corrected within 60 days of this motion. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

VIII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (April 20, 2010)

Ms. DeYoung referred to page 2, third paragraph from the bottom, should read "Mr." Nave.

Mr. Bonsignore referred to page 6, the last paragraph before item E, the information should refer to 6 x 6 chamfered "posts" not "piers."

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

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. FYI report

City of Kalamazoo Historic District Commission Minutes

May 18, 2010

Page 15 of 16

430 W. Walnut

Ms. Ferraro referred to a picture of a property owned by O'Brien Real Estate. The porch has been as is for approximately 40 years. The porch has been cut back for a long time. It is a deck with part of the original porch roof over the top. Around the edge of the deck is a twisted metal rail. It is too short to meet the current code. The owner has added a massive wooden stair guard rail. The owner is asking for a rail height waiver. Ms. Ferraro advised that she could not provide a waiver for the non-historic rail. The owners requested a temporary approval with the understanding that the rail will be redone over the next three or four years.

The rail needs to be taller. Providing a rail height waiver for a non-historic railing would set a bad precedent. They need to put on a rail that meets code or meets the historic district standard, which would mean a wooden rail, up to 30" tall. There is a question of what should be done with the metal posts. Ms. Ferraro is working with the owners regarding the existing vinyl windows and the light fixture that was added over the back door without approval. The door has been there since before 1997 when this area became part of the historic district.

Mr. Bonsignore referred to the application for the Cohen property on a previous agenda. Mr. Bonsignore abstained from voting, but advised that he would have argued against the roof pitch variation.

Mr. Nave expressed concern about VI on the current agenda. He felt that the HDC was forced to pass this agenda item. He didn't receive any notice regarding this item. The HDC should have been part of the solution regarding the ordinance change. He advised that he would be writing a letter to express his concerns. With the proposed ordinance change, the HDC will lose control over non-historic buildings. He wanted to suggest that control be strengthened in the future.

Discussion followed with regard to the DDRC. Ms. Ferraro advised that the DDRC is part of site plan review within the city. It is not controlled by DKI, although they do have members on the board. The current members include the Historic Preservation Coordinator, an architect, someone from the project review committee for DKI, and a downtown business owner. Site plan review has the force of law and they report to site plan review. If the DDRC doesn't approve a project, the Site Plan Review committee will not allow permits to be issued. The DDRC has been in existence for about 5 years. Ms. Ferraro advised that she is comfortable with the proposed revisions to the code. Ms. Ferraro reviewed the decisions that have been made over the last 20 years with regard to decisions that were made regarding non-historic structures. All of the owners were allowed to do exactly what they wanted to do with non-historic buildings in historic districts.

Ms. Seaverson commented that, procedurally, the proposed changes seem to be fine. She expressed concern about the problems that could arise if the HDC is not commenting on the requests. Ms. Ferraro advised that she would be updating the standards for the DDRC. Text for non-historic buildings in historic districts can be part of the guidelines. She suggested presenting the revisions to the HDC this summer. Ms. Seaverson concurred that the HDC should have input. The existing DDRC guidelines are on the city's website. The HDC has the right to withdraw their approval, but they would have to vote on that change.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cinabro, supported by Ms. Seaverson, moved to adjourn the May 18, 2010 meeting of the Historic District Commission. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Submitted by: _____ Dated: _____
Recording Secretary

Reviewed by: _____ Dated: _____
Staff Liaison

Approved by: _____ Dated: _____
HDC Chair