

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**Minutes**  
**October 20, 2009**

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

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

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

Guests: Peter Carroll, Richard Emig and Chris Roussi, applicants for HDC

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Bonsignore called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

**II. APPROVAL OF ABSENCES**

Mr. Nave had not arrived at the meeting, but was expected shortly. The other commissioners were present.

**III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

There were no changes to the agenda.

**Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved approval of the October 20, 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**

None

**VII. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. 439 Woodward (Case #: IHA 09-0410)**

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

**B. 824 W. Kalamazoo (Case #: IHA 09-0436)**

Ric Wiessner, Falco Corp., was present to discuss the application. The application requests that the open deck at the rear northeast corner of the house be enclosed.

Mr. Wiessner stated that the house is a licensed adult foster care home. The home recently became a non-smoking facility. They are required by state law to provide a structure or area that is outside but out of the weather for the residents who smoke.

Mr. Oudsema commented that he is typically not enthused about add-ons. However, the proposed enclosure is at the back of the house. He stated that he walked in back of the properties that are adjacent to 824 W. Kalamazoo. There are similarities to what is being proposed for the subject property and what already exists at 808, which is two houses away. The enclosure the applicant is proposing is in keeping with the neighborhood.

Mr. Nave commented that there are two nice original elements that are still showing, the turned legs under the bay window and the small side porch that faces the driveway – both on the east side. It appears that what the applicant is proposing will destroy most of the original porch. Mr. Nave recommended matching the existing 8” aluminum siding rather than the wood siding. Ms. Ferraro stated that it is important to consider what would happen if the owner decides to strip the aluminum siding off the rest of the house. If aluminum siding is used on the addition, the owner would have to add wood siding to the addition when the rest of the house is restored. Based on other houses in the area, there is likely 3” or 4” wood siding under the aluminum.

Mr. Bonsignore pointed out that the application is for 8” wide horizontal siding. Mr. Wiessner stated that the intention was to match the size of the existing siding.

Mr. Nave stated that the trim should match the original trim on the house. Mr. Nave inquired if another door would be installed leading into the smoking porch. Mr. Wiessner stated that the existing entry door on the house will remain. After stepping up to the porch, you will turn right and enter the enclosed smoking porch through an opening without a door. The original porch will be unaltered. The deck that was added onto the porch will be enclosed. The post to the right of the east steps will remain.

Mr. Bonsignore stated that the drawing provided shows some of the original porch being enclosed. Mr. Wiessner indicated that the drawing does not correctly depict that detail. Mr. Bonsignore questioned how the roof over the entrance to the basement tied in with the rest of the house. It appears to have a different pitch. Mr. Wiessner stated that it will follow the existing pitch up to meet the porch roof.

Ms. Seaverson referred to the slope over the back door on the north/rear elevation. She inquired if the applicant would be matching that slope or the slope of the existing porch roof. Mr. Wiessner advised that both slopes are the same.

**Ms. Seaverson, supported by Mr. Cinabro, moved approval of the application for 824 W. Kalamazoo Ave. with regard to enclosing the open deck at the rear, northeast corner of the house, based on Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines numbers 9 and 10. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Wiessner advised that the enclosed space will not be heated. The foundation under the posts will remain. The wall will connect to the column by the right of the door and be flashed around the end. A 2 x 4 will be screwed onto the post and built out from that point.

Discussion followed with regard to the siding. It was suggested that selection of siding be left to the discretion of the builder, as long as the siding is not vinyl.

**C. 909 Oak (Case #: IHA 09-0437)**

Andrew Thompson, owner, was present to discuss the application. The application requests the addition of a wood framed chimney on the north side of the house.

Mr. Thompson stated that the boxed in chimney would replace the brick chimney that was failing and was removed from the north side of the house. The plan is to construct a box sided with cedar clapboards to enclose the galvanized furnace vent.

Mr. Nave inquired if the chimney is required or if it could be vented to the outside through the sill or apron board without a chimney. Mr. Thompson stated that he would like to vent it to the outside (through the wall rather than the chimney). The furnace and water heater would be vented through the chimney. The furnace is 80% efficient and there is a requirement that it be vented through the chimney. Mr. Nave suggested installing a furnace that would not require venting through a chimney. Mr. Thompson stated that he had considered that. However, since this is a two unit, he would need to replace one furnace with two furnaces and redo the duct work.

Mr. Nave expressed concern that the 4" lap siding would not be appropriate. Ms. Ferraro stated that the cement asbestos siding is very hard to find, unless you go with the GAF replica siding that is available. Mr. Thompson indicated that he was not sure when/if the siding would be removed. It was suggested that cement fiber Hardie board could be used. It would look similar to the existing siding but there is no asbestos in it. Mr. Nave suggested that 4' x 8' flat panels could be used so that it looks like an addition, rather than extending the lap siding all the way up.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if the original siding is under the asbestos siding, and Mr. Thompson responded in the affirmative. She inquired if the original siding was exposed where the chimney was removed. She also inquired as to the approximate age of the previous chimney. Ms. Ferraro stated that the chimney predates the siding, and the chimney does not appear to be original to the house. There is no chimney inside the house; it was attached to the outside of the house. It was constructed of wire-cut brick, which dates from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, probably the teens or 1920's. Mr. Thompson stated that the only place the chimney was attached was with flashing at the roof.

Mr. Tribu inquired if Mr. Thompson had looked in the basement to find where the chimney originally came up through the house. Mr. Thompson stated that if there was a chimney, it is completely gone. There doesn't appear to be a chase through the middle of the house to provide venting. He also considered venting the furnace out the back of the house, but the distance is too long for that to be feasible.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired as to how high above the roof the chimney would be constructed. Mr. Thompson stated that Matt Kuiper did the drawing and he determined that the chimney would be 3 feet above the roof. That can be adjusted as necessary. Ms. Ferraro advised that Frank Springer, Building Inspector, and Butch Hays, Plumbing/Mechanical Inspector, were also consulted. Mr. Nave mentioned that a cricket should be installed on the south side of the chimney to shed water on either side of the chimney, where the chimney intersects the roof.

Ms. Seaverson expressed support for using the smooth cement-fiber siding as Mr. Nave suggested. She suggested determining if the brick chimney has its own historic significance. It is not original to the house, but it is still in the period of significance for the South Street district. Ms. Ferraro stated that the brick chimney was not a character defining feature or a change that acquired significance over time. This was a plain, straight chimney with no embellishment and no cap.

**Mr. Nave, supported by Ms. Seaverson, moved approval of the application for 909 Oak with the siding to be flat Hardie-type fiber-cement siding, painted and with 1" x 4" trim of the same material. The joints are to be flashed and covered with the trim. An appropriately sized cricket is to be installed to shed water around the chimney. The chimney should be the width of the existing chimney and a minimum depth to accommodate the flue. It should be trimmed against the existing house. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Tribu inquired as to the dimensions of the new chimney. Mr. Thompson stated that he wants it to be the same dimensions as the previous chimney, which was 20" across with a 6" flue. The chimney will be the minimum size to accommodate the dimension of the flue.

#### **D. 425 Oak (Case #: 09-0435)**

Jason Farmer, architect, was present to discuss the application. The application requests reconfiguration of the exterior and the store front.

Mr. Farmer advised that the building had been condemned. It was used for a market and the owners are trying to reopen it. The exterior of the building is in bad shape and needs updates.

Drawings were provided with the application. A barrier-free ramp and steps will be added to the front to meet code requirements. One option is to leave the front of the building as is and build the ramp and stairs inside. Another option is to remove the ramp and stairs and add a covered porch with a flat roof and have an open ramp (exposed to the air) so the space would not have to be heated.

There is horizontal vinyl lap siding on the original building and vertical steel siding on the south addition. The entire building needs new roofing. The size of the building will not be increased, the footprint will remain the same. Many renovations need to be done on the inside, including updates to the restrooms, floor joists and electrical service to bring the building up to code.

Mr. Nave asked when the building was condemned. Mr. Farmer stated it occurred in May of 2009. Ms. Ferraro stated that if there is no action taken on the part of the owner to remedy the

conditions cited in the condemnation, the zoning would revert to single-family after 12 months, and the non-conforming commercial use would be gone.

Mr. Nave inquired as to the purpose of the deck-like structure on the roof of the south addition. Mr. Farmer advised that the intention is to install the mechanical units on the roof deck instead of in the basement. The railing is screening for the mechanical units.

Ms. Seaverson referred to the letter from Pete Eldridge that was included in the packet. She inquired if this matter needs zoning approval before it is reviewed by the HDC. Ms. Ferraro stated that this property has an existing, non-conforming zoning designation and does not require zoning approval at this point. The multi-family residential zoning designation stays in effect as long as the business is active or if they are doing repairs.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if this is a contributing building to the district. Ms. Ferraro stated that is probably is because so much of the original appearance remains and it is very similar to at least to other buildings in the district. Mr. Bonsignore mentioned that it has a false front, which indicates that it has been a commercial building for a long time.

Mr. Cinabro inquired if the owners would need approval from the zoning board if the building were demolished and rebuilt. Ms. Ferraro confirmed that to be true. The applicants would also need design approval from the HDC. Mr. Cinabro commented that it was his understanding that the applicants wouldn't need to go to the ZBA if the application is approved by the HDC. Ms. Ferraro confirmed that to be correct.

Mr. Nave inquired if the vertical front would be restored, and Mr. Farmer responded in the affirmative. There is vinyl siding on the front of the building. The intention is to tear off the existing siding and install wood siding or smooth fiber composite siding to match the historic time period when it was built. The railing around the top of the roof over the entrance is for aesthetics. It is intended to tie in the screening around the mechanical units on the roof of the south addition.

Ms. Seaverson referred to the existing gable front addition and inquired if that was all to be taken off. Mr. Farmer advised that is one of the options. The two front elevations depicted show how the building would look with or without the front addition. The right elevation shows how the building would look if the gabled roof were to remain. The elevation on the left shows how the building would look with the entire front addition removed back to the original wall. The deck underneath and the steps would be open to the air with a new foundation to support the porch roof. Ms. Ferraro commented that the pattern on the floor inside indicates there was originally a centered front entrance and the left elevation would be closer to the original configuration.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired about the siding to be used. Mr. Farmer stated that he is proposing to repair the vinyl siding on the north, east and south facades (front, back and left). The west (front) façade of the original building would be composite or wood siding. There are a couple of doors in the south addition that are no longer needed for the floor plan. The doors would be removed and those areas would be filled in and painted to match.

Ms. Seaverson stated that she liked the idea of removing the existing front and opening it up. She suggested steering the applicants toward one option and asking for more details as that is developed.

Mr. Nave suggested installing a metal canopy sloping slightly toward the street rather than having the railing. Mr. Farmer indicated that was a possibility. The existing drawing shows a ¼" slope with some "2 x" material underneath for a frame and a rubber roof on top. The pitch could be raised a little and a metal roof could be installed. Mr. Nave mentioned that many historic buildings in other cities have a sloped canopy for people to walk under. He mentioned Omaha, Nebraska has examples of that in their historic district. Ms. Ferraro advised that a plain canopy without the proposed decorative rail would be preferable because it would not be adding a conjectural historic feature. It would be similar to what we know was there. It would also be less expensive.

**Mr. Nave moved approval of the application for 425 Oak, with the existing front elevation to be removed back to the vertical, western-style front, which is to be restored as close to original as possible, with wood siding, trim and brackets; the siding and trim are to be repaired on the other three sides. A sloped metal roof (shed roof) is to be installed, with a slope as low as 6 inches per 12 feet. The ramp is to be installed to historic district standards. The air conditioning enclosure/railing should be done to historic district standards (painted wood). The roof should be done to historic district standards with a dark drip edge. The soffits should be as close to original as possible. Details are to be worked out with the Historic Preservation Coordinator. The motion died for lack of support.**

Mr. Nave inquired as to the type of siding that was originally on the building. Mr. Farmer advised that there is board and batten siding on the front addition. It is visible in some of the photographs. It is rotten along the bottom and it all needs to be replaced. Mr. Nave inquired as to the type of siding behind the extended front, on the original western façade. Mr. Farmer advised that there may be wood siding under the vinyl siding but he is not sure what condition it is in. Mr. Nave suggested continuing down with the four inch lap siding and using a twelve inch batten on center.

Discussion followed with regard to the roof. Mr. Farmer stated that he thought the roof was 1" x 6" planks with home built trusses.

Mr. Oudsema inquired if Mr. Nave intended to allow the applicants to put the mechanical equipment on the roof. Mr. Oudsema suggested that the mechanicals be installed at the back of the building. Ms. Ferraro advised that there is not enough land in the back of the building to accommodate the mechanicals, the fence is up against the back of the building. Mr. Oudsema suggested that the applicants come up with a different plan. The neighborhood views this property as a nuisance, even when it was operating. The applicants should do a proper restoration of the building. The HDC wouldn't allow other applicants to place mechanical equipment on their roof.

Ms. Ferraro advised that the HDC has allowed some equipment to go on the roof, but in the least visible location possible. The area proposed by the applicant is a visible location and it is in a residential area. The mechanicals will need to be screened in an appropriate way. Mr. Nave

mentioned that there appears to be some land on the north side of the building. Mr. Farmer advised that there is only about three feet of land in that location. The applicants are proposing to have one unit for heating and cooling. Mr. Bonsignore suggested putting the mechanical equipment inside of a dormer on the roof.

Ms. Seaverson mentioned that an air handler on the roof would create noise. That issue may not be under the jurisdiction of the HDC but it could become a problem. It should be enclosed in some fashion that would address the view and the noise. Discussion followed with regard to the best way to conceal the mechanical equipment. Putting the mechanical equipment on the ground in front of the vertical sided south addition would make it vulnerable to vandalism and it would take up one of the parking spaces. It could be placed on the roof behind the false wall that's at the front of the building, but it would not be totally concealed. The mechanical equipment could be placed in the attic with extensive venting.

Ms. Seaverson suggested matching the siding on the western front if there is evidence showing what was there.

**Ms. Seaverson, supported by Mr. Cinabro, moved approval in concept of the removal of the existing front structure at 425 Oak back to the front vertical wall. The applicants are to return to the HDC with further details. With a roll call vote, the motion carried with a majority vote. Mr. Oudsema was the only dissenting vote.**

Mr. Bonsignore requested that the applicants provide architectural drawings when they return to the HDC.

### **Public Comment**

Pat McCarthy, Vine Neighborhood Association, stated that this building and its condition have been a problem for the neighborhood for an extended period of time. The Vine Neighborhood Association would like to encourage the HDC to protect the historic nature of the neighborhood. The Neighborhood Association would like to see this building come back as something attractive, clean, well lit and not disruptive. There have been comments about the mechanical equipment being located on the roof and the noise issue that creates.

Mr. Bonsignore inquired if Ms. McCarthy had any comments about the suggestions and options that have been discussed during the meeting. Ms. McCarthy stated that as a resident of the Vine Neighborhood, she has concerns about the mechanical equipment being on the roof because of the noise. This is a residential area, but there have been small commercial buildings in the neighborhood in the past. Commercial buildings should be appropriate, fit into the neighborhood well, and respect the historic nature of the neighborhood.

Mr. Oudsema commented that the operation of this facility in the past five years has been nothing but a nuisance for the neighborhood. It appears that the ownership has not changed hands during that time. It would be nice to see improvements in the condition and operation of the building so that it becomes something the neighborhood can be proud of.

Mr. Nave stated that he has been viewed unfavorably when he worked on several of these projects in other neighborhoods. It is a question for the neighborhood if zoning or other approval

is needed where there is a choice. Legally, this building can be fixed up as is, with approval from the HDC regarding exterior restoration.

Mr. Oudsema stated that he didn't have a problem with the property being fixed up and put back in service. He commented that the current owners put themselves in this position. If they had operated their business differently and held their business to a different standard, they wouldn't be here at all. The reason they are here is that this property was condemned and the business was closed. There is no reason to be accommodating with regard to reopening the business, unless the owners want to make the appropriate repairs to the building.

Ms. Ferraro advised that there is about three weeks before the deadline for the next meeting. She offered to meet with the applicants to discuss the details of the project.

**E. 921 Walwood (Case #: IHA 09-0435)**

Andrew Gyorkos, owner, was present to discuss the application. The application requests replacement of the existing soffits with aluminum to make the roof edge more consistent.

Mr. Gyorkos stated that he was in the process of fixing soffits on the house when he discovered that the previous owner made repairs to the roof and not all elements of that repair were lined up correctly. There is not enough space to put another board in between the drip edge and the fascia. Mr. Gyorkos referred to the #2 picture provided, which shows existing aluminum fascia. The third level has soffit and fascia wrapped in aluminum. Mr. Gyorkos doesn't want to wrap the soffits, he just wants an L piece of aluminum between the drip edge and the wood fascia to cap it. There is a gap and the air goes to the soffit and the attic.

Mr. Gyorkos is suggesting an L-style type of fascia to close the gap, which will extend downward and wrap the outer portion. Mr. Nave suggested having the fascia come down an inch. Mr. Gyorkos stated that some of the fascia would have to be revealed in order to nail it.

Mr. Tribu suggested removing the existing fascia and replacing it. Mr. Gyorkos stated that the fascia was already removed and fixed. He built it back to where it should be. There was already fascia in place, they just left enough room to tuck the aluminum into the space. When Mr. Gyorkos built it back and removed the rotten wood, he installed the 1" x 8". Mr. Bonsignore inquired as to what would prevent the applicant from cutting the wood to fit in the same way they are proposing to install the aluminum. Mr. Gyorkos advised that one part of the house didn't need to be redone, and by the time they got to that corner it became an issue. The material is nailed in place now and they don't want to tear it out.

Mr. Nave inquired as to when the front door was replaced. Mr. Gyorkos stated that the door was replaced prior to the time he purchased the property in May of 2009.

Mr. Nave suggested using the L-shaped piece of aluminum and pushing it up to meet the bottom of the plywood and that should close the gap. Mr. Gyorkos is asking to face nail the piece of aluminum from the bottom so the outer most part is wrapped. The fascia is aluminum. The two windows on the roof are fully wrapped and have aluminum soffit. One side is aluminum and he is asking to put the aluminum back on the sides that were repaired. He estimated that the roof

will probably last another ten years, and he hopes to redo it correctly when the time comes. He doesn't have the funds to put a roof on it now.

Ms. Seaverson inquired if the aluminum fascia was there when the project began. Mr. Gyorkos responded in the affirmative. He stated that the east side of the house is still wrapped in aluminum. Ms. Ferraro stated that the aluminum predates the historic designation in 1997.

Mr. Bonsignore suggested taking a piece of aluminum, folding the bottom edge, installing it with a consistent reveal, and trim it to fit without having it cover the fascia. There would be a hem at the bottom and it should lay flush. Mr. Gyorkos questioned how that would look with the east side which is still intact. Mr. Bonsignore mentioned that Mr. Gyorkos would have to create the piece of aluminum he intends to install. The commercial fascia has creases in it, but this would have a smooth face. It would be rolled out and painted white to match the trim.

**Mr. Nave, supported by Mr. Tribu, made a motion to finish the soffits on three sides to match the existing east side regarding 921 Walwood. With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

**A. 439 Woodward (Case #: IHA 09-0410)**

Karen Leys was present to discuss the application. The application requests the addition of a mudroom to the west/rear door. Similar in design to the mudroom on the west face of the north addition next to the driveway.

Ms. Leys stated that the house currently has four units, it had six units when she bought it. She referred to the drawings that were provided in the packet and pointed out the location of the dog doors. She would like to add the mud room so she can control the wind coming in her kitchen. She has a number of house doors stored in her barn that have been removed from the house at various times so she is hoping that the builder can use one of those. It will either be a five horizontal panel door with two panels cut out for windows, or it would be a five panel door with the mid-horizontal with the top verticals removed for a window.

The historic photos show a mud room/porch in that location. Ms. Leys stated that she didn't have any details regarding the materials to be used. She will use whatever is required. She is hoping to get approval for a metal roof, which would be easier than installing shingles in that location.

**Mr. Nave, supported by Ms. DeYoung, moved approval of the application for the mudroom at 439 Woodward, with materials to match the house. The doors are to match historic district standards, the trim should match the house or the historic photo. A thin metal roof can be installed over the mudroom to shed water. Details are to be worked out with the Historic Preservation Coordinator. With a roll call vote, the motion carried with six ayes and one abstention. Mr. Bonsignore abstained.**

Mr. Tribu inquired if the mudroom will be incorporated into the posts that are supporting the second floor deck or will it be free-standing. Ms. Leys advised that the mudroom will be incorporated into those posts. She suggested that when the framing is built for the wall, the builder will be nailing the inside 2 x 4's to the existing 4 x 4's. Ms. Seaverson expressed concern that the proposed construction would make the roofing difficult. A box inside the box would

make it more durable with respect to keeping water out. When installing the roofing, flashing to wood 8 x 8's isn't advisable because it will let water in through the wood.

Mr. Nave suggested that Ms. Ferraro could review any details as the project progresses. The motion was amended accordingly. Mr. Bonsignore advised that he would abstain from voting because he serves on a board with Ms. Leys and he would not be comfortable voting on this matter.

**F. 814 W. South Street (discussion only)**

Kevin Osborne was present to represent the property. The owners would like to build a one or two-car garage on the lot. The garage may look like a carriage barn. Mr. Osborne is looking for ideas and suggestions.

Mr. Osborne advised that he would like to construct a 24' x 24' garage in the back yard. He is working with the zoning official. He would like some recommendations from the HDC regarding the design and materials they would prefer. The garage cannot be bigger than 24' x 24' due to the zoning setback limitations. There were two different locations proposed to the zoning official. One suggestion was to construct the garage over the existing driveway – directly north of the street and visible from South Street. Historic pictures indicate that there was a garage in that location on the lot. The second option is to place the garage in the back yard, which would leave a 36% green space, but would be less visible from South Street. The minimum requirement is 40% green space. The second option would require approval by the zoning board.

Mr. Nave inquired if the zoning board would allow a decrease in the setback at the rear of the property. Mr. Osborne stated that someone in the building department advised that the setback is 5 feet from the property line in the back and on the sides. Mr. Nave stated that the code requires 1.5 parking spaces per unit; he inquired if there would be enough room to satisfy the parking requirements. Mr. Osborne stated that he would like to put the garage over the grass so as to not lose the existing parking. The owners have purchased part of the parking lot at 820 West South. There are three units, a one-bedroom, a two-bedroom and a three-bedroom. The one-bedroom is owner occupied.

Ms. Ferraro advised that the house was built in the late 1860's or early 1870's. A garage with the appearance of a carriage house, with a higher roof and a slightly higher pitch would be appropriate. A garage with a shed roof and false front would also be a possibility.

Mr. Nave provided a couple of pictures of a garage that would be appropriate for an Italianate house; the property is owned by Sharon Carlson. Ms. Ferraro stated that the pictures of the original garage at 814 W. South show very little detail. There is a low-pitched, hip roof on the existing house. The garage roof would not necessarily have matched the house, but it would probably have been similar. If the owners decide to construct a story and a half or two story carriage barn, it should be similar in shape and have a roof pitch similar to the house. If they construct a garage with a shed roof, the pitch should also be similar. Many of the houses along West South street have garages with shed roofs.

Mr. Osborne stated that he is looking for ideas to take to the next zoning board meeting. If he can get approval from the zoning board regarding the issue with the green space, he will return to the

HDC for design approval. Mr. Bonsignore suggested that two doors would be more appropriate than one large door. Mr. Tribu suggested that Ms. Ferraro provide to the applicants the examples of garages she has from old house catalogs. Ms. Ferraro stated that the examples she had were from the teens, 1920's and 1930's, any of those styles would be appropriate. There are examples of carriage barns in the Stuart Neighborhood and South Street Historic District that would also be appropriate.

Mr. Oudsema suggested that it would be more appropriate to construct the garage or carriage house in a location that is visible from the street. Ms. Ferraro suggested that the style of the structure might determine where it is located. If the owners decide to construct a garage it might make more sense to locate it at the end of the driveway, which is more common for cars. If they prefer to construct a carriage barn, it could be located at the end of the driveway or slightly behind the house. Ms. Seaverson stated that she was in favor of locating the garage where it had been in the past.

Mr. Nave mentioned that if the parking to the north will take the place of the parking in the back yard, the garage could be located at the end of driveway and the owners could have a nice back yard. Mr. Osborne stated that the owners are still considering their options. They would like to purchase the entire lot next door. The person who used to own it just repurchased it after foreclosure. He doesn't want to sell the entire lot without the buildings that face Academy. At this point, he has only sold three of the parking spaces to the applicants. The parking lot fronts on South Street. The parking lot is currently used for the brick apartment buildings on Academy. The lot sat vacant for about two years, but now all of the units in the apartment building are full so there are no extra spaces to purchase.

Mr. Osborn inquired if the HDC would prefer a hip roof on the garage/carriage barn. Ms. Ferraro stated that due to the age of the house, its location and what has happened around it, there is a wide range of choices available that other homes may not have. It would be appropriate to go with a carriage barn look with a hip roof similar to the house. A garage with a shed roof would also be appropriate or a style similar to what might have been there in the 1920's or 1930's. The biggest question is where to place the garage.

Mr. Bonsignore mentioned that placing a faux historic carriage barn would not be in keeping with the standards. It would not be appropriate to encourage someone to build something that looks like it has been with the house. It would be preferable to have something that is different but complimentary, with details that mimic the house.

Ms. Ferraro suggested a style of garage from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, clearly made for cars, would be more appropriate than a carriage barn appearance. Unless pictorial evidence is discovered showing what was actually there.

Mr. Osborne inquired if it would be preferable to side the garage with Cedar or some other suitable wood material, with a four inch lap to match the house. Or would it be more appropriate to use fiber cement? Ms. Ferraro mentioned that garages were often made with car siding and that might be an appropriate material to use for this project. Ms. Ferraro advised that she could meet with Mr. Osborne to further discuss the details.

Mr. Osborne stated that he received a notice that a storm door needs to be installed on the entrance to one of the apartments for ventilation. He inquired what he would be allowed to install in that location off the driveway. Ms. Ferraro advised that a half light window, not a self-storing style, would be preferred. It should be a paneled door with no cross buck. The door must fit the existing opening. Ms. Ferraro can approve the door administratively.

#### **VIII. Approval of Minutes (September 15, 2009)**

Mr. Bonsignore requested the following change: Page 10, last paragraph, the sentence referencing, "detailed pictures of the windows" should state, "at 609 Elm Street."

Ms. DeYoung requested the following change: Page 9, under FYI Report, the second line should read, "Ms. Ferraro stated that the window repair workshop for contractors held in July did not utilize all of the grant (delete the "s") funds."

**Mr. Oudsema, supported by Mr. Nave, moved approval of the September 15, 2009 HDC minutes as amended. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

#### **XIII. Other Business**

##### **A. Appoint a committee to review applications for open seat on HDC in January**

Mr. Oudsema is term limited and will be vacating his seat on January 1, 2010. Three people have applied for his position on the HDC. Ms. DeYoung, Mr. Oudsema, and Mr. Bonsignore volunteered to serve on the nominating subcommittee.

**Ms. Seaverson, supported by Mr. Tribu, moved to form a committee to review applications for the seat to be vacated by Mr. Oudsema on the HDC in 2010. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

Ms. Ferraro advised that the City Commission reviews and approves appointments to commissions once a month during their last meeting of the month. Due to uncertainty of the City Commission's schedule in December because of the holidays, it would be preferable for the subcommittee to make the recommendation in November so there will be no lapse in membership on the HDC. Also, the January HDC meeting is sometimes cancelled due to a lack of applications. The City Commission will likely approve the recommendation in December.

Ms. Ferraro advised that the subcommittee should contact the applicants to set up an interview. The subcommittee would then make a recommendation at the November meeting, and the HDC would vote on the recommendation at that time.

Ms. Seaverson advised that it would be helpful to have the subcommittee recommendations in the November HDC packets.

#### **IX. Adjournment**

**Mr. Oudsema, supported by Ms. Seaverson, moved to adjourn the October 20, 2009 meeting of the Historic District Commission. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

Historic District Commission Minutes

October 20, 2009

Page 13 of 13

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

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

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

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

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

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

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