I. Call to Order:

II. Roll call and approval of absences:

   Eric Stucky
   Dana Underwood
   John Mitchell
   Dan Kastner
   Andrew Grayson
   Jeremy Berg
   Karla Ragainis

   *For virtual meetings, during the roll call, each commissioner needs to state their name, and where they are currently located and attending from.*

III. Approval of Agenda:

IV. Introduction of Guests:

V. Public Comment on non-agenda items

VI. Disclaimer

   Chapter 16, Section 22 of the City of Kalamazoo Code of Ordinance states:
   Historical preservation is a public purpose. To serve that purpose, the Historic District Commission is hereby charged with the following responsibilities:
   a) The Kalamazoo Historic District Commission is empowered to regulate Work on the exterior of historic resources and non-historic resources in historic districts in the City of Kalamazoo and shall otherwise have all powers invested in Historic District Commissions pursuant to the Local Historic Districts Act, MCLA § 399.201 et seq. 1970 PA 169, as Amended 1992.
   b) To regulate Work on resources which, by City ordinance, are historic or non-historic resources located within local historic districts, including but not limited to the moving of any structure into or out of, or the building of any structure in, an historic district.

   The following documents are available in the Community Planning and Economic Development Department located at 245 North Rose Street. These documents will help assist property owners in understanding the responsibilities of owning property in a local historic district, MCLA § 399.201 et seq. 1970 PA 169 as Amended 1992 (Michigan Local Historic District Act); Code of Ordinances City of Kalamazoo, Michigan (Chapter 16 - Historic District); Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation & Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, 1990; Standards and Guidelines for Kalamazoo Historic Districts, and maps of Kalamazoo Local Historic Districts. These documents and maps are also available on the city of Kalamazoo website at [https://www.kalamazoocity.org/historicpreservation](https://www.kalamazoocity.org/historicpreservation)

VII. HEARINGS – Old Business moved to end of agenda

NEW BUSINESS:

   a) 266 East Michigan 5:05pm  Owner: 266 Michigan Ave Kalamazoo LLC
   Style – Commercial Italianate  Built: 1896
   Zone: CCBD  Owned since: 02/14/2020
   a) Addition at rear/south for elevator and stairs
   PPZ 21 - 0003  New Application
   Public Comment then Commission Deliberation
b) 229 Stuart Avenue  5:20pm  Dana Underwood
Style: Queen Anne  Year Built: 1872
Zone: RM-15  Owned since: 07/13/2009
a) Reconfigure and rebuild non-historic deck at west end of south side-first floor
b) Add small second floor deck – convert window to door same location
PPZ 21 - 0004  New Application
Public Comment then Commission Deliberation

c) 1545 Grand  5:35pm  Kelly Kronberg & Nora Neill
Style: Craftsman  Built: ca 1905
Zone: RS-5  Owned since: 5/16/2011
Addition at rear/south
PPZ: 21-0005  New application
Public Comment then Commission Deliberation

314 Monroe - Consultation for changes to much altered house at 314 Monroe – owners Laura and Peter Livingstone-McNelis. (Consultation ONLY – no decision may be made.)

OLD BUSINESS: NOTE – this will be at the end of the agenda

d) 816 Normal Court  Owner: James Wise
Style – Bungalow  Built: 1930
Zone: RM-15  Owned since: 07/19/1999
1. Determination of Demolition by Neglect
2. Report from Site visit committee: Dan Kastner, Eric Stucky and John Mitchell
EN 15-3283  Old Case
Public Comment then Commission Deliberation

e) CONSULTATION: 611 West South – alterations to garage/carriage barn
This is a consultation ONLY – the Historic District Commission will make no decision on this project. A consultation is intended to provide guidance and comments to the applicant before a complete application is presented at a hearing.

IX. Approval of Minutes – March 16, 2021 (ITEM F)

X. Administrative approvals –March 9 to April 13, 2021
a) No building permit required - none

Elm  501  gutters
Stuart  500  gutters
WestS  624  Reside NH garage
Academy  1521  Rebuild cast in place concrete steps to match
WestnedgeS  1109  Gutters
Monroe  115  Repair retaining wall

b) Building permit required - 1

WestnedgeS  434  Repair sagging porch
Elm  121  Replace NH Concrete entry & rail

XI. Other Business
XII. **Adjournment**  
Question and comments regarding this agenda or the Kalamazoo Historic District Commission should be directed to the Historic Preservation Coordinator at 337-8804.

**A note on quorum and Historic District Commission decisions:**
City of Kalamazoo Code of Ordinance – Chapter 16 – Historic District Commission – section 19 states: “A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. A majority of the appointed members is required to take action on all matters not of an administrative nature, but a majority of a quorum may deal with administrative matters.” All applicants should be aware that the minimum of four of the commissioners must vote for a motion for a decision to be made in all actions. Applicants may choose to postpone their review to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the commission before the commission begins their deliberations if fewer than seven commissioners are present. The postponement form is available from the coordinator and must be filled out and signed before the applicant leaves the meeting.

**GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AT HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETINGS**
The Historic District Commission recognizes that citizens who make the effort to attend a Commission meeting often feel passionately about an issue. The following guidelines are not meant to discourage individual expression; rather, they exist to facilitate the orderly conduct of business and to ensure that all citizens who wish to address the Historic District Commission are able to do so in an atmosphere of civility and respect.

- Out of respect for business being conducted during the meeting, turn off all cell phones and pagers prior to the meeting.
- Citizens have opportunities to address the Historic District Commission at the following times during a meeting:
- Address Non-agenda items at the beginning of the meeting. If you wish to speak about a specific review, please wait until that review comes to the commission.
- Consideration of Regular Agenda items. Citizens are permitted to speak to the Commission on project reviews after the applicant has made their presentation and prior to the Historic District Commission discussion. The Chair will call for comments from the public.

**NEW OWNERS in Historic districts*  
(No letters sent since August 2020)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Street w #</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>previous owner</th>
<th>current owner w address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

*NEW OWNERS in Historic districts*  
(No letters sent since August 2020)
Historic District Commission FYI - April 20, 2021

REVIEWS: Historic District Commission:

Through April 13, 2021   Through April 13, 2020

✓ HDC cases to 04/13/2021 –16 total

Fees total year to date, 2021 ……. $415

2021  2021  2020  2019 fees
- 7 no fee $ 0  15 no fee $ 0
- 7 bldg permit–$35* $ 245  4 $ 140
- 2 HDC hearing - $85 $ 170  5 $ 425
16 TOTAL $ 415  24 $ 665

Report on Michigan Tax Credit

Michigan enacts Public Act 343 of 2020 - State Historic Tax Credit
As we work to recover and revitalize Michigan communities, the new State Historic Tax Credit program signed into law by Governor Whitmer on December 30, 2020 will help support place-based projects while promoting the preservation of Michigan’s historic resources.

The MEDC and SHPO are already working to begin the required administrative rulemaking process, which based on state statute may last 12-18 months, to effectively establish and administer this program, ensuring developers, homeowners and communities can access this welcome support. Details such as application procedures, more detailed eligibility requirements, transfer rules, etc. will be determined as part of this process.

Eligible properties must be listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the State Register of Historic Sites, or be in a local historic district, and either be individually listed or contribute to a listed district. The credit has a $5 million cap per calendar year, which will be divided into:

- $2 million for commercial with expenses of $2 million or greater
- $2 million for commercial with expenses of less than $2 million
- $1 million total for residential projects

Credits will be awarded on a first-come, first-serve basis. Additional updates will be shared on this webpage. (Revised: 2/19/2021)
APPLICATION FOR PROJECT REVIEW – Historic District Commission Hearing

COMPLETE Applications for review at the Historic District Commission meeting including payment of the $85 hearing fee must be received by NOON on the 2nd Tuesday of the month- the meeting is on the 3rd Tuesday of the month.

(PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY - See instructions on reverse side)

Property Address: 266 E Michigan Ave.
Historic District: [ ] South/Vine [ ] Stuart [ ] West Main Hill [ ] Rose Place [X] Haymarket
Applicant: Pinnacle Construction Group Owner: 266 Michigan Ave Kalamazoo, LLC
Mailing Add. 1000 Front Ave NW Mailing add 1000 Front Ave NW
City State & Zip: Grand Rapids, MI 49504 City, State Zip: Grand Rapids, MI 49504
Phone: (616)828-8934 cell Phone: (616)451-0500 work
Email mp@askourclients.com Email mg@askourclients.com

Contractor:

( ) Work to be done by owner
Contractor Pinnacle Construction Group

Proposed Work: Use additional sheets to describe work if necessary

See attached sheets The first floor will maintain two commercial tenants. A new residential elevator, lobby and egress stair to be added to the south side. Floors 2, 3, and 4 to be renovated into 11 units from studios to 2 bedroom lofts. The exterior will remain unchanged with the exception of the new elevator/stairwell.

(______) This property has at least one working smoke detector for each dwelling unit. (Owner or applicant’s initials) * Required * see back

Applicant’s Signature: __________________________ Date: 3-30-21
Owner’s Signature: __________________________ Date: __________
(if different)

Case Number: PPZ- 21-0003 Date Received*: ______ March 30, 2021
Zoning CBD Year built: 1896 Complete application April 13, 2021
Owned since 02/14/2020

COMMISSION
Meeting Date: 04/20/2021
COMMENTS: __________________________________________________________________________

Approve in Concept Date: __________ Letter mailed ______________

FINAL ACTION
[ ] Approve [ ] Site Visit [ ] Approve w/Conditions [ ] Deny [ ] Postpone [ ] Withdrawn
ACTION DATE
Certificate of Appropriateness Issued __________________________________________________________________________
Notice of Denial with appeals information __________________________________________________________________________
Notice to Proceed __________________________________________________________________________ Comments: __________________________________________________________________________

Revised November 22, 2019
When reviewing plans, the Historic District Commission shall consider:
1) The Secretary of Interior's "Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings"; (2) Local design guidelines; (3) The historical or architectural value and significance of the structure resource and its relationship to the historical value of the surrounding area; (4) The relationship of the exterior architectural features of such structure resource to the rest of the structure resource and to the surrounding area; and (5) The general compatibility of exterior design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used; (6) Any other factor, including aesthetic, which it deems to be pertinent.
COMMISSION ACTIONS (Motions):
1. Approve the rear/south addition as proposed. The plan substantially complies with Secretary of the Interior Standards #9 and #10. The commission approves a Certificate of Appropriateness for this project. Approval of any final details to be delegated to the historic preservation coordinator.
2. The commission could postpone with the applicant’s consent, to ask for more details or to prepare a revised plan. The revised plan should include the following changes:
   a. ___________________________________________
   b. ___________________________________________
   If the applicant does not consent to a postponement, the commission must make a decision at this meeting or the May 18th meeting to comply with the 60-day rule.
3. The commission could deny, based on Secretary of the Interior Standards #9 & #10.

+++++++++++++++++++++++Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation+++++++++++++++++++++++ 

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation are ten basic principles created to help preserve the distinctive character of a historic building and its site, while allowing for reasonable change to meet new needs. The Standards are applied to projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

(Chapter 16) (d) When reviewing plans, the Historic District Commission shall consider): 1) The Secretary of Interior’s “Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings”; (2) Local design guidelines; (3) The historical or architectural value and significance of the structure resource and its relationship to the historical value of the surrounding area; (4) The relationship of the exterior architectural features of such structure resource to the rest of the structure resource and to the surrounding area; and (5) The general compatibility of exterior design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used; (6) Any other factor, including aesthetic, which it deems to be pertinent.
### Exterior Material Specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORTH ELEVATION</th>
<th>SOUTH ELEVATION</th>
<th>EAST ELEVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheathing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sheathing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sheathing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finish</strong></td>
<td><strong>Finish</strong></td>
<td><strong>Finish</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Color</strong></td>
<td><strong>Color</strong></td>
<td><strong>Color</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessories</strong></td>
<td><strong>Accessories</strong></td>
<td><strong>Accessories</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Elevations

#### North Elevation
- **Reference:** Elev.
- **Scale:** 3/32" = 1'-0"
- **Note:** Change to be removed and painted as required.
- **Material:** Aluminum/wood/fixed glazing.

#### South Elevation
- **Reference:** Elev.
- **Scale:** 3/32" = 1'-0"
- **Note:** Change to be removed and painted as required.
- **Material:** Aluminum/wood/fixed glazing.

#### West Elevation
- **Reference:** Elev.
- **Scale:** 3/32" = 1'-0"
- **Note:** Change to be removed and painted as required.
- **Material:** Aluminum/wood/fixed glazing.

---

**Additional Notes:**
- Change to be removed and painted as required.
- **Material:** Aluminum/wood/fixed glazing.

---

**HDC Meeting 04/20/2021**

---

**Reference:** Elev.

---

**Scale:** 3/32" = 1'-0"

---

**Note:** Change to be removed and painted as required.

---

**Material:** Aluminum/wood/fixed glazing.

---

**Reference:** Elev.

---

**Scale:** 3/32" = 1'-0"

---

**Note:** Change to be removed and painted as required.

---

**Material:** Aluminum/wood/fixed glazing.

---

**Reference:** Elev.

---

**Scale:** 3/32" = 1'-0"

---

**Note:** Change to be removed and painted as required.

---

**Material:** Aluminum/wood/fixed glazing.
(1) 266 East Michigan – north-front 2010
(3) South rear – east side 2003

(2) Rear-south 2010
(4) Meters – south rear – west side
Determination of Demolition by Neglect
Historic District Commission meeting – Tuesday March 16, 2021

Property address and owner

816 Normal Court
Style – Bungalow
Zone: RM-15
Owner: James Wise
Built: 1930
Owned since: 07/19/1999

Chapter 16 of the city of Kalamazoo Code of Ordinance Historic Districts
16-1 Definitions

DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT — Neglect in maintaining, repairing or securing a resource that results in deterioration of an exterior feature of the resource or the loss of structural integrity of the resource.


A. Upon a finding by the Commission that a historic resource within the local historic district or a proposed historic district subject to its review and approval is threatened with demolition by neglect, the Commission may do either of the following:

(1) Require the owner of the resource to repair all conditions contributing to demolition by neglect.
(2) If the owner does not make the necessary repairs within a reasonable time, the Commission or its agents may enter the property and make such repairs as are necessary to prevent demolition by neglect. The costs of the work shall be charged to the owner, and may be levied by the City as a special assessment against the property. The Commission or its agents may enter the property for purposes of this section upon obtaining an order from the circuit court.

DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT STEPS:

1. HDC considers IF a property’s condition has been caused by demolition by neglect.
   a. Physical condition of property
   b. Owner contacts and actions
2. Finding – demo by neglect exists or not
3. HDC finds demolition by neglect. – considered at HDC Meeting 03/16/2021
4. Owner is noticed to attend HDC with a plan for remedy.
5. If no action – with support of CPED & city attorney next steps are defined

Historic District Commission – cover sheet for demo by neglect
This house is a contributing historic resource in the South Street – Vine Area Local Historic District. This bungalow was built in 1930 for Mrs. Gertrude Reed, widow of James Reed.

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

• 1999-07-19 – house sold by Tom Cooper to James Wise $33,500
• 1999-11-16 – PB 99-0630- electrical permit – Sunburst Electric
• 1999-12-13 – PM 99-0456 – mechanical permit
• 2006-06-12 – IHV 06-00-11 **HDC Violation** – Installed new front door with side lites, new south 2nd floor window. Owner claims that the replacement door was from an energy grant from the Kalamazoo County Health Department and the second floor replacement window was installed by the previous owner (Equalizer photo dated 04-06-2000 shows the original two windows with the space between and not the round topped “Palladian” window.) Coordinator investigated since county was using Federal funds should have been reviewed by State Historic Preservation Office before work was done. County skipped that step OR SHPO did not consult HD maps.
• 2006-08-30 – site visit with owner to discuss remedies for 2nd floor windows and front porch rail
• 2009-04-01 – PB 09-0075 - KHARP program repairs (Kalamazoo Homeowners Assistance Repair Program) (Vestal Builders) front porch rail and deck
• 2014-07-30 – Stop Work order issued for removal of Transite siding
• 2014-09-11 – Site visit west window boarded. No electric, burst pipes. stripped siding.
• 2014-09-24 – IHA 14-0099 – owner has stripped the Transite cement asbestos siding and the underlaying wooden clapboard siding off of 90% of the house. Installed French doors on north/rear, 1st floor. Still an open case (2021/02/04) HDC approved
  o 1. Installation of smooth surfaced vinyl siding on 1st floor with 3”to4” wide corner boards & window casing.
  o 2. Installation of shingle or shake style vinyl siding on the second floor
  o 3. Repair deteriorated exterior wood to match existing, as needed
  o 4. Colors are owner’s option
  o 5. Final details or minor changes to be approved by the historic preservation coordinator
• 2014-10-21 – HDC hearing
  Proposed Work (Retroactive):
  1. Install vinyl siding on 1st and 2nd floor to replace cement asbestos siding (removed)
  Observations:
  • Original second floor siding was 3-tab, asphalt roof shingles
  • Cement-asbestos siding installed ca late 1940s
  • The sheathing had termite damage in the lower courses.
  • Stop work order issued – July 30, 2014
  • Anti-blight enforcement (EN-14-2581) August 26, 2014 – no siding over sheathing
  • New French doors installed at rear without HDC review or building permit
• 2014-10-29 – site visit with coordinator – referred owner to Community Homeworks for help
• 2015-01-07 – PM 15-0009 – New furnace and water heater
• 2015-04 - Admin approval for Habitat for Humanity to help with siding and window **repairs**
• 2015-07-20 – windows removed, Habitat withholds help and approval for repairs.
• 2015-07-23 – EN 15-3283 – Owner has removed 10 original windows sashes and casings. All materials, except a few sashes, were discarded. No Historic District approval. This follows last summer when the same owner stripped all the siding off the house.
2015-08-18 – HDC hearing to consider windows
2015-08-20 – Owner located old windows that are a close match to what was removed –
administrative approval for installation of these five windows
  – Conditions – this approval does NOT lift the condemnation or address the first floor, triple
  porch window. Original window sashes from this house, currently stored on the front porch
  and in the back yard should be stored inside the house. Work will require a permit and should
  be complete by 10-20-2015.
2015-09-14 – PB 15-0656 - permit for windows and front porch (steps and rails)
- 2015-07-28 – Owner James Wise write a letter delivered to the city managers office apologizing for
removing the windows and stating that installing the HDC approved siding would be no good if the
windows were “all rotted”
- 2015-07-28 EN 15-3347 – VBS Tier 1 violation - Windows removed; house gutted; no gas; no electric;
historic violations
  o 2016-09 “Owner was going to set up a meeting at house in September 2016 to verify utilities
  are on. No meeting was set up and siding is still missing. Permit is required for siding, historic
  approval is needed.”
- 2016-04-28 – angry note from owner claiming that vinyl windows have been installed on Austin Street so
why can’t he install vinyl at 816 Normal Ct. The coordinator replied and told him that Austin Street is
outside the historic districts.
- 2017-06-12 – Rachel Luscomb recommends all inspections be two people due to volatile tempers of owner
and son
- 2017-06-13 – Owner writes note asking the city to give him a loan to fix the house.
- 2019-12-23 – PE 19-0742 – Electrical inspector notes that nothing was filled in on permit for electrical
  Stephen Meints
- 2019-12-23 – note from owner “I love my house. “Sorry for my son’s mouth. I apologize to all.”
- 2019-12-26 – PB 19-0887 – permit application denied – zoning and building rejected
- 2020-10-20 – permit denied – no plans submitted
- 2020-12 – Inspection with Rachel Luscomb and building official Jon Klesko: STRUCTURAL SUPPORTS
THROUGHOUT PROPERTY HAVE BEEN REMOVED, PIECED BACK TOGETHER, NOT TO
CODE. CAMPER IN BACK YARD, GENERATOR IN HOUSE. APPEARS THAT HOMEOWNER
IS LIVING IN CAMPER. OWNER HAS ARCHITECT DRAWINGS OF HOUSE AND IS
PLANNING ON MAKING REPairs. OWNER WAS HANDED BLANK PERMITS FOR THE
NECESSARY REPAIRS
  o Siding is still off. Some window openings are covered only with plastic.
- 2021-01-22 – coordinator received plans from Rachel Luscomb addressing the necessary structural repairs
to 816 Normal Court. As noted in building inspections, the interior is gutted with load bearing walls
compromised or missing and termite damage is common. Plans were drawn by architect Frank Lucatelli on
March 3, 2020. This project needs:
  o New engineered beam to support dormer on south side of roof
  o Reinforcement of basement beam with a 6” x 6” post
  o Termite damage in the post supporting the main structural beam at the basement ceiling must be
  replaced – north end of the main beam which is built from 3-2” x 8” is also termite damaged and
  must be repaired (specifications in plans require impregnating with marine epoxy.)
  o New rear deck
  o Optional front roofed entry deck in addition to existing porch
- 2021-03-10 – as of this date there are no open permits or active permit applications.
Property address | Enforcement | Built | Owned since
--- | --- | --- | ---
816 Normal Court | EN 15-3283 | 1930 | July 19, 1999

Applicant  
HDC and Housing inspector
Owner  
James Wise
Meeting date: March 16, 2021

Historic District  
South Street-Vine Area
Zoning  
RM-15 (Residential, Multi-Dwelling)
Additional Permits required  
Building Permits
Rental History: Not a rental since this sale in 1999

Previous reviews (HDC = commission meeting; Admin = administrative approval):  
See Chronology and Timeline

OBSERVATIONS:
Exterior – siding and several windows still missing
Interior – completely gutted, most work is not done to comply with the building code – this incomplete work may have made the structure unsound.

Demolition by neglect:
1. The house is intermittently open to casual entry.

FINDINGS OF FACT (From Building Department records):
The house is a vacant, blighted structure
DEFINITION: VACANT BLIGHTED STRUCTURE DEFINITION: A Vacant Blighted Structure is one that has been vacant and blighted for more than 30 days and two or more of the following applies:
- is open to casual entry
- one or more window boarded
- one or more utilities required for occupancy disconnected
- because of disrepair or lack of maintenance, is in a condition that makes it reasonably apparent to the public that the structure is unoccupied

Sec. 16-1 Definitions.
Demolition by neglect means neglect in maintaining, repairing or securing a resource that results in deterioration of an exterior feature of the resource or the loss of structural integrity of the resource.

DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT STEPS:
1. HDC considers IF a property’s condition has been caused by demolition by neglect.
   a. Physical condition of property
   b. Owner contacts and actions
2. Finding – demo by neglect exists or not
3. HDC finds demolition by neglect. – considered at HDC Meeting 03/16/2021
COMMISSION ACTIONS (Motions):

a. The Historic District Commission finds that the house at 816 Normal Court is threatened with demolition by neglect. The commission cites the following historic features that require repair to Historic District Commission Standards:
   i. The missing window openings need to be filled with operable, wooden, double hung windows that comply with the HDC Standards.
   ii. Vinyl or wooden siding needs to be installed on the outside of the house as specified in the 10/21/2014 HDC Meeting
   iii. Any additional necessary exterior work, as identified by the building official or the enforcement team, needs to be reviewed and approved in advance of work beginning.

b. The Historic District Commission finds that the house at 816 Normal Court is threatened with demolition by neglect. The commission will schedule a SITE VISIT with no more than three commissioners, the owner and the coordinator to determine the scope of work including but not limited to the exterior cladding, windows, front steps and rear entry. The site visit will take place between March 177 and April 13, 2021. The proposed work will be reviewed at the April 20, 2021 Historic District Commission meeting and a date for completion will be set. If the owner does not complete the necessary repairs within a reasonable time, the Commission or its agents may enter the property and make such repairs as are necessary to prevent demolition by neglect. The costs of the work shall be charged to the owner, and may be levied by the City as a special assessment against the property. The Commission or its agents may enter the property for purposes of this section upon obtaining an order from the circuit court.

c. The Historic District Commission postpone the finding of demolition by neglect for more information or to allow the owner to gather information and details. The owner will need to be present for review at the next scheduled Historic District Commission meeting.

d. The Historic District Commission finds that the house at 816 Normal Court is not threatened with demolition by neglect.
3. Bearing Detail at Engineered Beam

4. Dormer Support and Closet Door Framing

Exist. Joists (Second Fl.)
Vapor Barrier

Drywall

1x4 Oak Trim
Both Sides

5/8" Drywall

New Continuous 2x4 to Extend Bearing Surface for Joists

Ex. Engineered Beam

Notch 2x6 Studs to New 2x4s

Patch Insul. as Needed

Drywall Over Vapor Over Vapor Barrier

Ex. Bearing Plate at Dormer Roof

New Header Below Ex. Plate (2) 2x4s

2x6 to Frame Door OP G

Track for Folding Closet Drs.

New 2x6 Studs

Line of Sloping Roof

Folding Doors May Cover Sloping Roof
3.0' x 7.0' 1/2" steel pl. both sides of wd. beam
3/16" bolt (typ.) w/ matching nut and 1" washer, both sides

Replace ex post w/ 6" x 6" (nom.) wd. post
top & bot of post
6" x 6" x 1/2" stl. bearing plate
leveling grout

Exist'g conc. fl.

Reinforcement of basement beam
14. The kitchen work to be done, is similar to the bathroom. All cabinets and fixtures are selected by the owner.

Second Floor Notes:

21. This is the same continuous bearing post that extends to the basement floor as Notes 5 & 11 show. This 4x4 post is to be incorporated in the new Closet walls which are also to be positioned to carry the bearing support for the West rafters of the South dormer roof. Do not cut joists but maintain continuous bearing from the dormer roof to the basement floor.

22. The masonry of the chimney just above the second floor is damaged and needs to be restored with matching masonry. (See Photo 4 on page 9)

23. Provide a heating duct chase to deliver heat to second floor.

24. The new wall separating Bedrooms 1 & 2 and extending to the West over the Stair enclosure, shall extend up to the bottom of the main roof's South slope.

25. The Closet walls on the East wall support the South dormer's East rafters. The 4x4 post shown is to extend to solid bearing on top of the engineered beam below. The existing engineered beam supports the second floor joists.

26. All shaded walls on the second floor are new, except for the south wall of the Toilet Room. The new walls enclosing the Stair Landing, Toilet and Laundry will all enclose a space with an new 7'-4" high ceiling above the second floor. Secure the Dormer roof structure's north-most joist to the wall described in note 24 above.
GENERAL NOTES and SPECIFICATIONS:

Basement Notes:

1. The post supporting the North end of the main structural beam at the basement ceiling, which supports the first floor is termite damaged and must be replaced by three (3) treated 4x4 posts between the top of the foundation wall and the bottom of the main beam. Verify dimensions at the site. Center the three posts on the center-line of the main beam.

2. The North end of the main beam, which is built from three 2x8s (7-1/2" x 6" full size) in the basement supporting the first floor is also termite damaged. It was deemed too costly to remove and replace the main beam. Repair as follows:

   Step one: remove and replace the damaged center 2x8 so that it completely and tightly fills the central 2" space of the beam, where the central beam is loose or damaged in the area shown on sheet 6. (See Photo 3 on page.)
   Step two: Impregnate the main beam between the North wall and the first post South of the North wall with a marine epoxy, to be approved by the owner, in all areas of the beam where termite damage is found and let cure according to product specifications.
   Step three, once the marine epoxy has cured, install a 1/8" thick plate x 7 inches high x 3'-0" centered on the replaced post. One of two matching steel plates with matching pre-drilled bolt holes will be placed on each vertical side of the repaired beam. The bolt pattern is shown in Detail 2 on page 13. It may be necessary to remove and replace any duct-work on the east side of the beam that interferes with this repair.
   Step four: Secure plates with through bolts and washers bolted through the existing repaired and stabilized beam, as shown in Detail 2 on page 13.

3. The area designated by note three has minor termite damage at the North wall studs where they are in contact with the foundation. Inspect and treat all termite damage in the designated area with the same marine epoxy used for the main beam.

   4. The area designated by area four has somewhat greater termite damage than area three, including the 1x4 (nom.) joist-setting board below the first floor. Inspect studs for termite damage in the designated area 4 and impregnate the damaged areas with the same marine epoxy used in areas 2 and 3. Remove and replace the 1x4 joist-setting board and replace with a duplicate sized 1x board.

   5. Install a 4x4 post(s) with continuous bearing from the basement floor to the underside of the dormer roof bearing. See notes 11 & 21. Do not cut through joists but maintain continuous bearing from the dormer roof to the basement floor.

First Floor Notes:

11. This 4 x 4 post is a continuation of the post mentioned Basement Note No. 5. It must be aligned with the posts shown at notes 5 & 21. Do not cut joists but maintain continuous bearing to the basement floor.

12. All walls shown in the first floor plan are structurally in place, but all walls and ceilings need rough carpentry to form clean edges where necessary for new doors and corners and all walls and ceilings are to have drywall finishes installed after exterior insulation is installed in the exterior walls. Sub-flooring and finish floor covering is new on the first floor. Completion of the sub-floor and choice of floor covering materials will be selected by the owner. All first floor windows are existing, but need to be secured in their frames before drywall is installed.

13. All rough carpentry, insulation in exterior walls, and drywall installation for walls and ceiling is needed in the first floor bathroom. A 3'-0" x 6'-8" reused panel door is to be installed at the bathroom. All fixtures, cabinets and counters and flooring in the bathroom are new and provided by the owner.
Photo 4
View looking North from Bedroom 1.

The South face of the chimney will be the face of the future North wall of Bedroom 1.

Extend the North wall of Bedroom 1 to support the North-most rafter of the dormer roof over Bedroom 1. See Second Floor Plan.

---

Photo 4
Repair the damaged masonry on the existing chimney, and flue if damaged, at the second floor level.
**Photo 1** (Seen from South West)
View of typical bearing of second floor joists at the existing engineered beam.
Provide solid bearing for all joists directly above the engineered beam.
Also extend the bearing surface of the engineered beam by attaching a continuous 2x4 on each side of the engineered beam, North and South sides, with the top side of the 2x4 in contact with the bottom of the joists that bear on this beam.

**Photo 2** (Seen from North West)
Second view of Joists show in Photo 1.

- **INPESCT ALL JOIST AT ENGINEERED BEAM AND INSTALL MISING BLOCKING**
- **INSUFFICIENT BEARING**
  - **SEE DETAIL**

**Photo 3**
Existing Beam at North end of Basement supporting the First floor.
The existing beam is composed of three full size 2 x 8s (Each nominal 2 x 8 is a full 2" x 7-1/4" actual size).
The center 2x8 of the beam shall be replaced by the same full size 2x8, or if unavailable, by a laminated 1x8 (3/4” thick) and a 1-1/2 x8 (1-1/4” thick).
See Detail 1 for reinforcing steel plates to be attached to each side of the beam with through-bolts.

Temporary support to be removed.
Existing Column to be replaced with a 6” x 6” wood post.
SECOND FL. FRAMING PLAN

ROOF OVER PORCH

BEDROOM 1
CATHEDRAL CEILING
FULL WIDTH OF HOUSE

EXIST. FLOOR JOISTS
2X8 BLOCKING AT FLOOR JOISTS
SOUTH SIDES AT BEARING WALLS

BEDROOM 2
CATHEDRAL CEILING
FULL WIDTH OF HOUSE

1X4 POST TO BEAM BELOW

TOILET

STAIRWELL

LAUNDRY

INSULATE DECK
5/8" PLYWOOD DECK
7’4” HIGH CEILING
ABOVE 2ND FLOOR
2X8 FRAMING
1’4” MAX O.C.

MAIN ROOF RIDGE
EXTEND THIS WALL
TO UNDERSIDE
OF MAIN RIDGE

DUCT CHASE
EXIST. FLOOR JOISTS

FOR DORMER RAPERES

BEARING WALL FOR
DORMER RAPERS

1-4’ O.C.
CTMR

0’ 1’ 5’ 6’
Design for the Remodeling of James Wise Residence
618 Normal Court
Kalamazoo, MI 49007

Frank Lucatelli, Architectural Consultant
Frank@Lucatelli.org  269.344.0708
Design for the Remodeling of James Wise Residence
618 Normal Court
Kalamazoo, MI 49007

Frank Lucatelli, Architectural Consultant
Frank@Lucatelli.org  269.344.0708
04-06-2000 shows original pair of double hung windows in place on second floor dormer two years after owner claims the previous owner installed the replacement windows in the dormer.

(1) 816 Normal Ct 04/06/2000 SWcor
(3) 05/16/2006

(2) Late December 2008 – work specified for front porch repairs

HDC Meeting 03/16/2021
(1) 816 Normal Ct 07/19/2011 SWcor – siding UNDER Transite
(3) 816 Normal Ct 09/10/2014 SEcorner

(2) 816 Normal Ct 09/10/2014 SW corner
(4) HDC approved vinyl shake on 2nd, vinyl clapboards on 1st 09/24/14

HDC Meeting 03/16/2021
(1) 816 Normal Ct 10/01/2015 W side – siding + windows gone
(3) 816 Normal Ct 10/01/2015 East side – siding and windows gone

(2) 816 Normal Ct 10/01/2015 triple 1st floor porch windows gone
(4) 816 Normal Ct 10/29/2015 East side - some windows back in
APPLICATION FOR PROJECT REVIEW - Historic District Commission Hearing

COMPLETE Applications for review at the Historic District Commission meeting including payment of the $83 hearing fee must be received by 4:30 pm on the 2nd Tuesday of the month- the meeting is on the 3rd Tuesday of the month.

(Please Print Clearly - See instructions on reverse side)

Property Address: 229 Stuart Avenue

Historic District: [ ] South/Vine [X] Stuart [ ] West Main Hill [ ] Rose Place [ ] Haymarket

Applicant: Stuart Avenue Properties
Owner: Dana Underwood

Mailing Address: 229 Stuart Avenue
City, State & Zip: Kalamazoo, MI 49007

Phone: 269-330-5350
Email: Dana@Stuartavenue.com

Contractor: [ ] Work to be done by owner

Proposed Work: Use additional sheets to describe work if necessary

See attached sheets

This property has at least one working smoke detector for each dwelling unit.

(Owner or applicant's initials)(Required) *See back

Applicant's Signature: Dana Underwood Date: 04/13/2021
Owner's Signature: Dana Underwood Date: 04/13/2021

COMMISSION Hearing fee paid $85

Meeting Date: 04/20/2021

COMMENTS: ____________________________

Approve in Concept Date: ______/____/____

Letter mailed ______/____/____

FINAL ACTION

[ ] Approve [ ] Site Visit [ ] Approve w/Conditions [ ] Deny [ ] Postpone [ ] Withdrawn

ACTION DATE ______/____/____

Certificate of Appropriateness Issued ______/____/____

Notice of Denial with appeals information ______/____/____

Notice to Proceed ______/____/____

Comments ____________________________

Revised 2/2016
(1) 229 Stuart – 04-13-2021 Southwest corner/south side
(3) 04-13-2021 South side looking NW
(2) 04-13-2021 Southwest corner
(4) 04-13-2021 South side - all
When reviewing plans, the Historic District Commission shall consider:

1) The Secretary of Interior's "Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings";
2) Local design guidelines;
3) The historical or architectural value and significance of the structure resource and its relationship to the historical value of the surrounding area;
4) The relationship of the exterior architectural features of such structure resource to the rest of the structure resource and to the surrounding area; and
5) The general compatibility of exterior design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used; and
6) Any other factor, including aesthetic, which it deems to be pertinent.
COMMISSION ACTIONS (Motions):
1. Approve the rear/south addition as proposed. The plan substantially complies with Secretary of the Interior Standards #9 and #10. The commission approves a Certificate of Appropriateness for this project. Approval of any final details to be delegated to the historic preservation coordinator.
2. The commission could postpone with the applicant’s consent, to ask for more details or to prepare a revised plan. The revised plan should include the following changes:
   a. ___________________________________________
   b. ___________________________________________
   If the applicant does not consent to a postponement, the commission must make a decision at this meeting or the May 18th meeting to comply with the 60-day rule.
3. The commission could deny, based on Secretary of the Interior Standards #9 & #10.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are ten basic principles created to help preserve the distinctive character of a historic building and its site, while allowing for reasonable change to meet new needs. The Standards are applied to projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

(Chapter 16) (d) When reviewing plans, the Historic District Commission shall consider: 1) The Secretary of Interior’s “Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings”; (2) Local design guidelines; (3) The historical or architectural value and significance of the structure resource and its relationship to the historical value of the surrounding area; (4) The relationship of the exterior architectural features of such structure resource to the rest of the structure resource and to the surrounding area; and (5) The general compatibility of exterior design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used; (6) Any other factor, including aesthetic, which it deems to be pertinent.
The property has two porch/decks on the south side of the structure. The Southeast porch is part of the original structure as indicated in the 1908 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. The Southwest deck was added sometime in the 1980s, and is the one we want to demo and replace.
The current deck is level with the first floor of the dwelling and is irregular in shape with wide steps descending to the garden at an angle.
The plan is to demo the existing deck and construct a smaller, covered porch that mimics the Southeast porch in size and look, and includes an upper deck accessible from a door (that would replace the current second floor window).
Decking – wood
Roofing – shingles to match existing roof
Posts/railings – wood
Lower windows – reuse if possible
Lower door – wood with upper glass/lower panel
Upper window – replace with wooden door, upper glass, lower panel
APPLICATION FOR PROJECT REVIEW – Historic District Commission Hearing

COMPLETE Applications for review at the Historic District Commission meeting including payment of the $83 hearing fee must be received by 4:30 pm on the 2nd Tuesday of the month- the meeting is on the 3rd Tuesday of the month.

(PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY - See instructions on reverse side)

Property Address: 1545 GRAND AVENUE

Historic District: [ ] South/Vine [ ] West Main Hill [ ] Haymarket

Applicant: Kelley Kronberg & Nora Neill
Mailing Address: 1545 GRAND AVENUE
City, State, Zip: Kalamazoo, MI 49006
Phone: 269-779-4374
Email: 1545grand @ gmail.com

Contractor: __________________________

( ) Work to be done by owner

Proposed Work: Remove existing addition on SE corner, SW corner, and sleeping porch on back of house
Rebuild 2 story addition on south side of house with proper foundation.
Siding - Hardi cement board (match garage), Marvin windows- aluminum clad, wood interior

This property has at least one working smoke detector for each dwelling unit.

Applicant’s Signature: __________________________ Date: 4 / 10 / 21
Owner’s Signature: __________________________ Date: 4 / 10 / 21

Hearing fee paid $85 ______ / ______

Certificate of Appropriateness Issued ______ / ______
Notice of Denial with appeals information ______ / ______
Notice to Proceed ______ / ______ Comments ______ / ______
(1) 1545 Grand Ave – 04-13-2021 North-front
(3) Looking SE from Grand

(2) 04-13-2021 Southwest corner
(4) 04-13-2021 South side from Henderson Court
When reviewing plans, the Historic District Commission shall consider:

1. The Secretary of Interior's "Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings";
2. Local design guidelines;
3. The historical or architectural value and significance of the structure resource and its relationship to the historical value of the surrounding area;
4. The relationship of the exterior architectural features of such structure resource to the rest of the structure resource and to the surrounding area;
5. The general compatibility of exterior design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used;
6. Any other factor, including aesthetic, which it deems to be pertinent.

Historic Preservation Coordinator
KALAMAZOO HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

APPLICATION FOR PROJECT REVIEW

STAFF COMMENTS

Property address 1545 Grand Ave
Applicant Kelly Kronberg & Nora Neill
Owner Kelly Kronberg & Nora Neill
Received 04/13/2021

CASE # PPZ 21-0005
Year built: ca 1916
Owned since 05/16/2011
Meeting date: 04/20/2021

Previous reviews (HDC = commission meeting; Admin = administrative approval):
2008 – Fence in back yard, replace glass in front windows (Admin)
2011 – Roof (Admin)
2012 – Remove existing single car garage, build new 2 car garage (HDC)
2013 – Repair integral gutters (Admin)
2014 - Fence in back yard (Admin)

Historic District West Main Hill
Zoning RS-5

Additional Permits required – building

Rental History: NA

Proposed Work:
  a) Remove existing attrition at rear and build a new addition

Observations:
  • The original house is stucco – the sleeping porch addition (ca 1925) is clad with wooden clapboards.

Applicable Criteria

(1) Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation - #9 and #10
  #9 - New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
  #10 - New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

HDC Meeting 04/20/2021
COMMISSION ACTIONS (Motions):
1. Approve the rear/south addition as proposed. The plan substantially complies with Secretary of the Interior Standards #9 and #10. The commission approves a Certificate of Appropriateness for this project. Approval of any final details to be delegated to the historic preservation coordinator.
2. The commission could postpone with the applicant’s consent, to ask for more details or to prepare a revised plan. The revised plan should include the following changes:
   a. ___________________________________________
   b. ___________________________________________
   If the applicant does not consent to a postponement, the commission must make a decision at this meeting or the May 18th meeting to comply with the 60-day rule.
3. The commission could deny, based on Secretary of the Interior Standards #9 & #10.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation
The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation are ten basic principles created to help preserve the distinctive character of a historic building and its site, while allowing for reasonable change to meet new needs. The Standards are applied to projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.
1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

(Chapter 16) (d) When reviewing plans, the Historic District Commission shall consider: 1) The Secretary of Interior’s "Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings"; (2) Local design guidelines; (3) The historical or architectural value and significance of the structure resource and its relationship to the historical value of the surrounding area; (4) The relationship of the exterior architectural features of such structure resource to the rest of the structure resource and to the surrounding area; and (5) The general compatibility of exterior design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used; (6) Any other factor, including aesthetic, which it deems to be pertinent.

HDC Meeting 04/20/2021
ITEM D

HDC Meeting 04/20/2021

(1) 611 West South – north front 2004
(3) House and garage 2009
(2) 2009 Northwest corner
(4) 2014 NE corner photo by Fran Dwight
Determination of Demolition by Neglect
Historic District Commission meeting – Tuesday March 16, 2021

Property address and owner

816 Normal Court
Style – Bungalow
Zone: RM-15

Owner: James Wise
Built: 1930
Owned since: 07/19/1999

1. Determination of Demolition by Neglect

EN 15-3283 Old Case

Chapter 16 of the city of Kalamazoo Code of Ordinance Historic Districts
16-1 Definitions

DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT — Neglect in maintaining, repairing or securing a resource that results in deterioration of an exterior feature of the resource or the loss of structural integrity of the resource.


A. Upon a finding by the Commission that a historic resource within the local historic district or a proposed historic district subject to its review and approval is threatened with demolition by neglect, the Commission may do either of the following:

(1) Require the owner of the resource to repair all conditions contributing to demolition by neglect.

(2) If the owner does not make the necessary repairs within a reasonable time, the Commission or its agents may enter the property and make such repairs as are necessary to prevent demolition by neglect. The costs of the work shall be charged to the owner, and may be levied by the City as a special assessment against the property. The Commission or its agents may enter the property for purposes of this section upon obtaining an order from the circuit court.

DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT STEPS:

1. HDC considers IF a property’s condition has been caused by demolition by neglect.
   a. Physical condition of property
   b. Owner contacts and actions

2. Finding – demo by neglect exists or not

3. HDC finds demolition by neglect. – considered at HDC Meeting 03/16/2021

4. Owner is noticed to attend HDC with a plan for remedy.

5. If no action – with support of CPED & city attorney next steps are defined
816 Normal Court (west from 516 Locust) 06-21-235-006
This house is a contributing historic resource in the South Street – Vine Area Local Historic District. This bungalow was built in 1930 for Mrs. Gertrude Reed, widow of James Reed.

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

- 1999-07-19 – house sold by Tom Cooper to James Wise $33,500
- 1999-12-13 – PM 99-0456 – mechanical permit
- 2006-06-12 – IHV 06-00-11 **HDC Violation** – Installed new front door with side lites, new south 2nd floor window. Owner claims that the replacement door was from an energy grant from the Kalamazoo County Health Department and the second floor replacement window was installed by the previous owner (Equalizer photo dated 04-06-2000 shows the original two windows with the space between and not the round topped “Palladian” window.) Coordinator investigated since county was using Federal funds should have been reviewed by State Historic Preservation Office before work was done. County skipped that step OR SHPO did not consult HD maps.
  - 2006-08-30 – site visit with owner to discuss remedies for 2nd floor windows and front porch rail
- 2009-04-01 – PB 09-0075 - KHARP program repairs (Kalamazoo Homeowners Assistance Repair Program) (Vestal Builders) front porch rail and deck
- 2014-07-30 – Stop Work order issued for removal of Transite siding
- 2014-09-11 – Site visit west window boarded. No electric, burst pipes. stripped siding.
- 2014-09-24 – IHA 14-0099 – owner has stripped the Transite cement asbestos siding and the underlaying wooden clapboard siding off of 90% of the house. Installed French doors on north/rear, 1st floor. Still an open case (2021/02/04) HDC approved
  - 1. Installation of smooth surfaced vinyl siding on 1st floor with 3”to4” wide corner boards & window casing.
  - 2. Installation of shingle or shake style vinyl siding on the second floor
  - 3. Repair deteriorated exterior wood to match existing, as needed
  - 4. Colors are owner’s option
  - 5. Final details or minor changes to be approved by the historic preservation coordinator
- 2014-10-21 – HDC hearing
  **Proposed Work (Retroactive):**
  1. Install vinyl siding on 1st and 2nd floor to replace cement asbestos siding (removed)
  **Observations:**
  - Original second floor siding was 3-tab, asphalt roof shingles
  - Cement-asbestos siding installed ca late 1940s
  - The sheathing had termite damage in the lower courses.
  - Stop work order issued – July 30, 2014
  - Anti-blight enforcement (EN-14-2581) August 26, 2014 – no siding over sheathing
  - New French doors installed at rear without HDC review or building permit
- 2014-10-29 – site visit with coordinator – referred owner to Community Homeworks for help
- 2015-01-07 – PM 15-0009 – New furnace and water heater
- 2015-04 - Admin approval for Habitat for Humanity to help with siding and window **repairs**
- 2015-07-20 – windows removed, Habitat withdraws help and approval for repairs.
- 2015-07-23 – EN 15-3283 – Owner has removed 10 original windows sashes and casings. All materials, except a few sashes, were discarded. No Historic District approval. This follows last summer when the same owner stripped all the siding off the house.
• 2015-08-18 – HDC hearing to consider windows
  • 2015-08-20 – Owner located old windows that are a close match to what was removed – administrative approval for installation of these five windows
    ▪ Conditions – this approval does NOT lift the condemnation or address the first floor, triple porch window. Original window sashes from this house, currently stored on the front porch and in the back yard should be stored inside the house. Work will require a permit and should be complete by 10-20-2015.
  • 2015-09-14 – PB 15-0656 - permit for windows and front porch (steps and rails)

• 2015-07-28 – Owner James Wise write a letter delivered to the city managers office apologizing for removing the windows and stating that installing the HDC approved siding would be no good if the windows were “all rotted”
• 2015-07-28 EN 15-3347 – VBS Tier 1 violation - Windows removed; house gutted; no gas; no electric; historic violations
  • 2016-09 “Owner was going to set up a meeting at house in September 2016 to verify utilities are on. No meeting was set up and siding is still missing. Permit is required for siding, historic approval is needed.”

• 2016-04-28 – angry note from owner claiming that vinyl windows have been installed on Austin Street so why can’t he install vinyl at 816 Normal Ct. The coordinator replied and told him that Austin Street is outside the historic districts.
• 2017-06-12 – Rachel Luscomb recommends all inspections be two people due to volatile tempers of owner and son
• 2017-06-13 – Owner writes note asking the city to give him a loan to fix the house.
• 2019-12-23 – note from owner “I love my house. “Sorry for my son’s mouth. I apologize to all.”
• 2019-12-26 – PB 19-0887 – permit application denied – zoning and building rejected
• 2020-10-20 – permit denied – no plans submitted
• 2020-12 – Inspection with Rachel Luscomb and building official Jon Klesko: STRUCTURAL SUPPORTS THROUGHOUT PROPERTY HAVE BEEN REMOVED, PIECED BACK TOGETHER, NOT TO CODE. CAMPER IN BACK YARD, GENERATOR IN HOUSE. APPEARS THAT HOMEOWNER IS LIVING IN CAMPER. OWNER HAS ARCHITECT DRAWINGS OF HOUSE AND IS PLANNING ON MAKING REPAIRS. OWNER WAS HANDED BLANK PERMITS FOR THE NECESSARY REPAIRS
  • Siding is still off. Some window openings are covered only with plastic.

• 2021-01-22 – coordinator received plans from Rachel Luscomb addressing the necessary structural repairs to 816 Normal Court. As noted in building inspections, the interior is gutted with load bearing walls compromised or missing and termite damage is common. Plans were drawn by architect Frank Lucatelli on March 3, 2020. This project needs:
  • New engineered beam to support dormer on south side of roof
  • Reinforcement of basement beam with a 6” x 6” post
  • Termite damage in the post supporting the main structural beam at the basement ceiling must be replaced – north end of the main beam which is built from 3-2” x 8” is also termite damaged and must be repaired (specifications in plans require impregnating with marine epoxy.)
  • New rear deck
  • Optional front roofed entry deck in addition to existing porch
• 2021-03-10 – as of this date there are no open permits or active permit applications.
## DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT - COMMISSION DETERMINATION

### STAFF REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property address</th>
<th>Enforcement</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>Owned since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>816 Normal Court</td>
<td>EN 15-3283</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>July 19, 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applicant**  
HDC and Housing inspector  
**Owner**  
James Wise  
**Meeting date:** March 16, 2021

**Historic District**  
South Street-Vine Area  
**Zoning**  
RM-15 (Residential, Multi-Dwelling)  
**Additional Permits required**  
– Building Permits

**Rental History:** Not a rental since this sale in 1999

**Previous reviews** (HDC = commission meeting; Admin = administrative approval):  
See Chronology and Timeline

### OBSERVATIONS:

Exterior – siding and several windows still missing
Interior – completely gutted, most work is not done to comply with the building code – this incomplete work may have made the structure unsound.

**Demolition by neglect:**
1. The house is intermittently open to casual entry.

### FINDINGS OF FACT (From Building Department records):

**The house is a vacant, blighted structure**

**DEFINITION:** VACANT BLIGHTED STRUCTURE DEFINITION: A Vacant Blighted Structure is one that has been vacant and blighted for more than 30 days and two or more of the following applies:
- is open to casual entry
- one or more windows boarded
- one or more utilities required for occupancy disconnected
- because of disrepair or lack of maintenance, is in a condition that makes it reasonably apparent to the public that the structure is unoccupied

**Sec. 16-1 Definitions.**

*Demolition by neglect* means neglect in maintaining, repairing or securing a resource that results in deterioration of an exterior feature of the resource or the loss of structural integrity of the resource.

### DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT STEPS:

1. HDC considers IF a property’s condition has been caused by demolition by neglect.
   a. Physical condition of property
   b. Owner contacts and actions
2. Finding – demo by neglect exists or not
3. HDC finds demolition by neglect. – considered at HDC Meeting 03/16/2021
COMMISSION ACTIONS (Motions):

a. The Historic District Commission finds that the house at 816 Normal Court is threatened with demolition by neglect. The commission cites the following historic features that require repair to Historic District Commission Standards:
   i. The missing window openings need to be filled with operable, wooden, double hung windows that comply with the HDC Standards.
   ii. Vinyl or wooden siding needs to be installed on the outside of the house as specified in the 10/21/2014 HDC Meeting
   iii. Any additional necessary exterior work, as identified by the building official or the enforcement team, needs to be reviewed and approved in advance of work beginning.

b. The Historic District Commission finds that the house at 816 Normal Court is threatened with demolition by neglect. The commission will schedule a SITE VISIT with no more than three commissioners, the owner and the coordinator to determine the scope of work including but not limited to the exterior cladding, windows, front steps and rear entry. The site visit will take place between March 177 and April 13, 2021. The proposed work will be reviewed at the April 20, 2021 Historic District Commission meeting and a date for completion will be set. If the owner does not complete the necessary repairs within a reasonable time, the Commission or its agents may enter the property and make such repairs as are necessary to prevent demolition by neglect. The costs of the work shall be charged to the owner, and may be levied by the City as a special assessment against the property. The Commission or its agents may enter the property for purposes of this section upon obtaining an order from the circuit court.

c. The Historic District Commission postpone the finding of demolition by neglect for more information or to allow the owner to gather information and details. The owner will need to be present for review at the next scheduled Historic District Commission meeting.

d. The Historic District Commission finds that the house at 816 Normal Court is not threatened with demolition by neglect.
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14. The kitchen work to be done, is similar to the bathroom. All cabinets and fixtures are selected by the owner.

Second Floor Notes:

21. This is the same continuous bearing post that extends to the basement floor as Notes 5 & 11 show. This 4x4 post is to be incorporated in the new Closet walls which are also to be positioned to carry the bearing support for the West rafters of the South dormer roof. Do not cut joists but maintain continuous bearing from the dormer roof to the basement floor.

22. The masonry of the chimney just above the second floor is damaged and needs to be restored with matching masonry. (See Photo 4 on page 9)

23. Provide a heating duct chase to deliver heat to second floor.

24. The new wall separating Bedrooms 1 & 2 and extending to the West over the Stair enclosure, shall extend up to the bottom of the main roof's South slope.

25. The Closet walls on the East wall support the South dormer's East rafters. The 4x4 post shown is to extend to solid bearing on top of the engineered beam below. The existing engineered beam supports the second floor joists.

26. All shaded walls on the second floor are new, except for the south wall of the Toilet Room. The new walls enclosing the Stair Landing, Toilet and Laundry will all enclose a space with an new 7'-4" high ceiling above the second floor. Secure the Dormer roof structure's north-most joist to the wall described in note 24 above.
GENERAL NOTES and SPECIFICATIONS:

Basement Notes:

1. The post supporting the North end of the main structural beam at the basement ceiling, which supports the first floor is termite damaged and must be replaced by three (3) treated 4x4 posts between the top of the foundation wall and the bottom of the main beam. Verify dimensions at the site. Center the three posts on the center-line of the main beam.

2. The North end of the main beam, which is built from three 2x8s (7-1/2" x 6" full size) in the basement supporting the first floor is also termite damaged. It was deemed too costly to remove and replace the main beam. Repair as follows:
   Step one: remove and replace the damaged center 2x8 so that it completely and tightly fills the central 2" space of the beam, where the central beam is loose or damaged in the area shown on sheet 6. (See Photo 3 on page.)
   Step two: Impregnate the main beam between the North wall and the first post South of the North wall with a marine epoxy, to be approved by the owner, in all areas of the beam where termite damage is found and let cure according to product specifications.
   Step three, once the marine epoxy has cured, install a 1/8th inch thick plate x 7 inches high x 3'-0" centered on the replaced post. One of two matching steel plates with matching pre-drilled bolt holes will be placed on each vertical side of the repaired beam. The bolt pattern is shown in Detail 2 on page 13. It may be necessary to remove and replace any duct-work on the east side of the beam that interferes with this repair.
   Step four: Secure plates with through bolts and washers bolted through the existing repaired and stabilized beam, as shown in Detail 2 on page 13.

3. The area designated by note three has minor termite damage at the North wall studs where they are in contact with the foundation. Inspect and treat all termite damage in the designated area with the same marine epoxy used for the main beam.

4. The area designated by area four has somewhat greater termite damage than area three, including the 1x4 (nom.) joist-setting board below the first floor. Inspect studs for termite damage in the designated area 4 and impregnate the damaged areas with the same marine epoxy used in areas 2 and 3. Remove and replace the 1x4 joist-setting board and replace with a duplicate sized 1x board.

5. Install a 4x4 post(s) with continuous bearing from the basement floor to the underside of the dormer roof bearing. See notes 11 & 21. Do not cut through joists but maintain continuous bearing from the dormer roof to the basement floor.

First Floor Notes:

11. This 4 x 4 post is a continuation of the post mentioned Basement Note No. 5. It must be aligned with the posts shown at notes 5 & 21. Do not cut joists but maintain continuous bearing to the basement floor.

12. All walls shown in the first floor plan are structurally in place, but all walls and ceilings need rough carpentry to form clean edges where necessary for new doors and corners and all walls and ceilings are to have drywall finishes installed after exterior insulation is installed in the exterior walls. Sub-flooring and finish floor covering is new on the first floor. Completion of the sub-floor and choice of floor covering materials will be selected by the owner. All first floor windows are existing, but need to be secured in their frames before drywall is installed.

13. All rough carpentry, insulation in exterior walls, and drywall installation for walls and ceiling is needed in the first floor bathroom. A 3'-0" x 6'-0" reused panel door is to be installed at the bathroom. All fixtures, cabinets and counters and flooring in the bathroom are new and provided by the owner.
Photo 4
View looking North from Bedroom 1.

The South face of the chimney will be the face of the future North wall of Bedroom 1.

Extend the North wall of Bedroom 1 to support the North-most rafter of the dormer roof over Bedroom 1. See Second Floor Plan.

Photo 4
Repair the damaged masonry on the existing chimney, and flue if damaged, at the second floor level.
**ITEM E**

**Photo 1** (Seen from South West)
View of typical bearing of second floor joists at the existing engineered beam.

Provide solid bearing for all joists directly above the engineered beam.

Also extend the bearing surface of the engineered beam by attaching a continuous 2x4 on each side of the engineered beam, North and South sides, with the top side of the 2x4 in contact with the bottom of the joists that bear on this beam.

**Photo 2** (Seen from North West)
Second view of Joists show in Photo 1.

INSTRUCT ALL JOIST AT ENGINEERED BEAM AND INSTALL MISSING BLOCKING IN SUFFICIENT BEARING SEE DETAIL

**Photo 3**
Existing Beam at North end of Basement supporting the First floor.

The existing beam is composed of three full size 2 x 8s (Each nominal 2 x 8 is a full 2" x 7-1/4" actual size).

The center 2x8 of the beam shall be replaced by the same full size 2x8, or if unavailable, by a laminated 1x8 (3/4” thick) and a 1-1/2 x8 (1-1/4” thick).

See Detail 1 for reinforcing steel plates to be attached to each side of the beam with through-bolts.
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04-06-2000 shows original pair of double hung windows in place on second floor dormer two years after owner claims the previous owner installed the replacement windows in the dormer.

(1) 816 Normal Ct 04/06/2000 SWcor
(3) 05/16/2006

(2) Late December 2008 – work specified for front porch repairs

(4)
(1) 816 Normal Ct 07/19/2011 SWcor – siding UNDER Transite
(3) 816 Normal Ct 09/10/2014 SEcorner
(2) 816 Normal Ct 09/10/2014 SW corner
(4) HDC approved vinyl shake on 2nd, vinyl clapboards on 1st 09/24/14
(1) 816 Normal Ct 10/01/2015 W side – siding + windows gone
(3) 816 Normal Ct 10/01/2015 East side – siding and windows gone
(2) 816 Normal Ct 10/01/2015 triple 1st floor porch windows gone
(4) 816 Normal Ct 10/29/2015 East side - some windows back in
I. Call to Order: Mr. Berg called the meeting to order at 5:02 PM

II. Approval of Absences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric Stucky</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Underwood</td>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mitchell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Kastner</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Grayson</td>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Berg</td>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla Ragainis</td>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Approval of Agenda: Motion approved as presented by Mr. Grayson and second by Ms. Underwood. All commissioners approve.

IV. Introduction of Guests: None

V. Public Comment on non-agenda items: None

VI. Disclaimer: Ms. Ferraro read the disclaimer into the record. 5:05 PM

VII. HEARINGS

OLD BUSINESS:

A). 816 Normal Court  5:07 pm  Owner: James Wise
   Style: Bungalow
   Zone: RM-15
   Built: 1930
   Owned Since: 07/19/1999

   1) Determination of Demolition by Neglect
      EN15-3283 – Old Case

   Code Compliance has asked the Historic District Commission to evaluate the condition of 816 Normal Court as possible case of Demo by Neglect defined in the code of ordinance as “neglect in maintaining, repairing or securing a resource that results in deterioration of an exterior feature of the resource or the loss of structural integrity of the resource.” This house is the case of lack of maintenance and lack of submitting permits or receiving approval from the Historic District Commission. The current owner doesn’t seek advance approval for exterior work regulated by the HDC or other work requiring permits. The current state of the house shows that siding has been stripped from most of the house and was removed 5 years ago and windows were removed by the owner shortly after. The interior demolition done by the owner and others has been substantial and may have compromised the structure integrity of the house.

   Ms. Luscomb has been dealing with Mr. Wise for several years and Mr. Wise has made promises throughout the years to work on the property, but lack of funds has made that difficult. Mr. Wise has applied for permits in the past but has been denied since he has tried to do the work himself but is not to industry standards or to code so he was told they would need to be applied for by a licensed contractor.
and for them to do the work. Ms. Luscomb states that she is surprised the roof did not collapse this past winter due to the lack of support. Ms. Ferraro also states that the home also has termite damage on the inside and out. The house still has multiple windows missing.

A finding by the commission of demolition by neglect will be followed by a request for the owner to present a plan for repairs. The HDC can take the case to circuit court and pay a contractor to do the minimum work necessary to stabilize the house. If this happens there would be a tax lien placed on the property.

Ms. Underwood is curious what spurred the owner to have an architect do the drawings and plans last March? Ms. Luscomb states that she requested this after the work he was doing on the house was making the house and structure compromised. Nothing has happened since this time. The most recent inspection that was done was by Ms. Luscomb and Mr. Klesko, our building inspector back in December of 2020.

Ms. Ragainis is curious if this is a case of lack of finance or just resistant to rules and regulation?

Ms. Luscomb believes it is both because Mr. Wise states that he loves his house and has done work but is not following code or listening to what needs to be done.

The house is currently vacant and there is a pop-up camper in the backyard. The owner denies living on the property even though the evidence shows different. The house has been condemned for years.

Mr. Grayson is looking at the options for the HDC at this point. One option is to do a site visit.

Ms. Ferraro thinks doing a site visit would impress the owner that the City of Kalamazoo is trying to help the homeowner.

Ms. Underwood appreciates the work that has gone into this property over the years but is curious if the lack of work over the past year is due to Covid and lack of contractors available to do the work.

Ms. Underwood is curious when the current roof was put on and Ms. Ferraro states its about 21 years old. They believe the roof is all that’s holding the house together at this point.

Mr. Grayson moved that the Historic District Commission finds that the house at 816 Normal Court is threatened with demolition by neglect. The commission will schedule a SITE VISIT with no more than three commissioners, the owner and the coordinator to determine the scope of work including but not limited to the exterior cladding, windows, front steps and rear entry. The site visit will take place between March 17 and April 13, 2021. The proposed work will be reviewed at the April 20, 2021 Historic District Commission meeting and a date for completion will be set. If the owner does not complete the necessary repairs within a reasonable time, the Commission or its agents may enter the property and make such repairs as are necessary to prevent demolition by neglect. The costs of the work shall be charged to the owner and may be levied by the City as a special assessment against the property. The Commission or its agents may enter the property for purposes of this section upon obtaining an order from the circuit court. With a second by Ms. Ragainis. Roll call all commissioners approve.
VIII. NEW BUSINESS:

B) 1539 Grand Ave  5:33 pm  
   Owner:  Steve East and Katie Johnson
   Style: Craftsman
   Built: 1910
   Zone: RS-5
   Owned Since: 11/20/2012

1) Addition at rear/south
   PPZ21-0001- New application

Mr. East and Ms. Johnson are the current owners of 1539 Grand Ave and have owned since 2012. They are currently planning an addition on the back of the house that will make the kitchen larger. The new addition will be about 400 sq ft. The view from the front of the house will remain the same. The new addition will have a flat roof. The rear or south side of the existing house has Hardie siding but some of the house has wood siding and there will be a transition to the new siding at the corners southeast and southwest corners. The current trim and windows are wood trim. Ms. Underwood states it looks like a nice new addition with the old and new architecture. Ms. Underwood moves to approve the addition on the south, rear side of the house as presented. The plan substantially complies with Secretary of the Interior Standards #9 and #10. The commission approves a Certificate of Appropriateness for this project. Approval of any final details to be delegated to the historic preservation coordinator with a second from Mr. Grayson. All commissioners approve.

C) 251 East Michigan  5:40 pm  
   Treystar-Main Street East
   Zone: CCBD
   Owned Since 1980

1) Projecting pillar sign on northeast corner of building Edwards and Whiskey Alley
2) Arch over mid-block alley off Michigan Avenue

PPZ21-0002 New application

Ms. Ferraro states this is located at Whiskey Alley and will be similar to the Bates Alley setup on the south side of East Michigan. The project proposes adding illuminated letters above the existing arch off the passage between East Michigan and Whiskey Alley and a column sign at the corner of Whiskey Alley and North Edwards. The scale and size are very similar to the column sign on the southeast corner of the building. Mr. Berg thinks the signs are appropriate. Mr. Vandersloot is here representing Treystar and states they will make sure the signs are comparable in size.

Mr. Grayson moved to approve the signs as proposed. The proposed signs substantially comply with Secretary of the Interior Standards #9 and #10. The commission approves a Certificate of Appropriateness for this project. Approval of any final details to be delegated to the historic preservation coordinator with a second from Ms. Underwood. With a roll call vote, all commissioners approve the signs.
**D) 314 Monroe- Consultation with Ms. Livingstone for changes at 314 Monroe. 5:55 pm**

Ms. Livingstone is the current owner of this house which became part of the historic district in 2007. The family wants to make some changes to the three panels of glass windows – currently a sliding door that serves as the primary entrance to the house, facing south. It was previously a door with windows on the side and this is what they want to go back to. They would like the door to be farther from the corner to prevent from hitting the mailbox and this will help with better insulation. Ms. Livingston would also like to have a storm door with an interior door that is fiberglass with a glass insert and would also like some siding in between the door and windows. Ms. Livingstone would like the window to have an awning above to shelter from rain and snow and to be able to have the window open no matter the weather.

Ms. Ferraro believes this is a non-contributing house in the historic district and will consider how this would affect the district and other houses in the area. Ms. Ferraro states the commission is more lenient because it’s been so altered over time.

Ms. Livingstone is interested in adding an awning to the front and back of the house to help with ice and protection from the elements. An additional reason is more protection for her daughter who has a skin condition aggravated by the sun but enjoys being outdoors. The plan is for her daughter to inherit this home in the long run. Ms. Livingstone has contacted different people about several different options but with the two different roof lines does pose a problem.

Mr. Grayson suggests possible using a pergola as an option. If this was the case this would be an administrative approval by Ms. Ferraro depending on the style and if the structure is permanent or not.

Mr. Berg suggests connecting the two different roof lines to make it a full covered porch with a column in the corner to make it look more like a bungalow.

Ms. Livingston has questions about what kind of door is acceptable. Ms. Ferraro would prefer the door with window and blinds rather than the door with the oval window.

**IX. Approval of Minutes:** February 16, 2021 (ITEM C) – Motion made and approved by Mr. Grayson and second by Ms. Underwood with all commissioner’s approval.

**X. Administrative approvals - February 9 to March 9, 2021 – No Action Needed**

**a) No building permit required- 0**

**b) Building permit required - 1**

Westnedge S 342  Roof retroactive permit app in June
XI. Other Business
How many commissioners have copies of Kalamazoo: Lost and Found and would you like a copy? All commissions attending would like a copy if not multiple.

Ms. Ferraro also wanted to talk about the Knights Inn on South Westnedge. The property has been purchased and will be converted to low income or transitional housing. The property will be 60 units and is currently housing some of the people from the homeless encampment near the river on Mills Street. The building is from the late 1950’s. They are wanting to reclad it in a more wood toned material. The plan is to replace and add more windows on the back of the building to provide more light into the rooms. The final sign design will probably be reviewed by the commission.

XII. Adjournment
Motion made to adjourn meeting by Ms. Underwood with a second by Mr. Grayson with all commissioners approve. Meeting adjourned at 6:31pm.

Question and comments regarding this agenda or the Kalamazoo Historic District Commission should be directed to the Historic Preservation Coordinator at 337-8804.
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