

DETROIT HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

Date: March 9, 2022

Due to COVID-19 restrictions, this meeting was held jointly in person and electronically via Zoom Meeting Link and audio-recorded.

[Actual Time] / Audio Recording Time Stamp

AGENDA

[05:34 pm]
00:27:44

I CALL TO ORDER

Director Landsberg called the meeting to order at 5:34 p.m.

Commissioner Miriani moved to appoint Commissioner Hamilton as Chairperson-Pro-tem

Commissioner A. Johnson - SUPPORT

Ayes – 4 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

Commissioner Lockhart moved to appoint Commissioner Miriani as Vice-Chair Pro-tem

Commissioner A. Johnson - SUPPORT

Ayes – 4 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[05:35 pm]
00:28:30

II ROLL CALL

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION		PRESENT	ABSENT
Tiffany Franklin	Chair		X
James Hamilton, Detroit	Chair Pro-tem	X	
Richard Hosey, Detroit	Commissioner	X (late)	
Alease Johnson	Commissioner	X	
Brandon Lockhart, Detroit	Commissioner	X	
Dennis Miriani, Detroit	Vice-Chair Pro-tem	X	
STAFF			
Brendan Cagney	PDD	X	
Audra Dye	PDD	X	
Garrick Landsberg	PDD	X	
Ann Phillips	PDD	X	
Daniel Rieden	PDD	X	
Jennifer Ross	PDD	X	
Rebecca Savage	HDAB	X	

[05:38 pm]
00:31:30

III APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Commissioner Miriani moved to approve the Agenda with the following change:

- Resolution 2201 has been added under New Business at the end of the meeting

Commissioner A. Johnson - SUPPORT

Ayes – 4 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[05:39pm] **IV APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**
00:32:00 None

[05:39pm] **V REPORTS**
00:32:00 None

[05:39pm] **VI APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO CONSENT AGENDA**
00:32:00 None

[05:39pm] **VII POSTPONED APPLICATION**
00:32:00 None

[05:39pm] **VIII EFFECTS OF CITY OR CITY-ASSISTED PROJECTS (ADVISORY DETERMINATIONS)**
00:32:00 None

IX APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

[05:39pm] • **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #22-7657 DR**
00:32:00

ADDRESS: 916 Edison

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Boston-Edison HD

APPLICANT/OWNER: Steven Smith

SCOPE OF WORK: Reconstruct rear portion of house (work initiated)

PROPOSAL: The applicant states that they would like to complete the reconstruction of the rear area of the house that was left unfinished at the time of purchase. Currently, this area is left with Tyvek wrap, vinyl siding, three (3) vinyl windows and a rear, steel door. The proposed completion of this reconstruction is pulled from the applicant’s narrative and follow-up questions to identify individual scope items found within the application.

Rear Reconstruction of House

- Retain dimensions of the existing floor plan at 8’ x 12’, and existing height at two stories.
- Retain the previously installed three (3) vinyl windows and a steel door.
- Remove exterior vinyl siding and install one of two options for siding:
 - Option A: Engineered treated wood siding panels 4’x8’, SmartSide 38 Series Cedar Texture, 8” OC Panel.
 - Option B: James Hardie board 8¼” x 144”.
 - Both options are primed painted and ready for installation, color white to match trim at front of house.

[05:47 pm] **PUBLIC COMMENT: START (AUDIO)**
00:40:28

- Melanie Markowiz stated their support and agreement with the staff report and added commentary on the windows, siding, materiality, and color.

[05:48 pm] **END (AUDIO)**
00:41:28

[5:42 pm]
00:35:35

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS

- Applicant present and stated that they wanted to understand what needed to be done to get work done properly.
- Commissioners review the conditions of the staff report with the applicant.
- Commissioners agree with staff report and conditions.

[5:49pm]
00:41:50

ACTION

Commissioner Miriani moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #22-7657 for 916 Edison** and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application **WILL BE APPROPRIATE** according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore **ISSUES** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following conditions:

- The vinyl windows be replaced with wood or wood clad material and match in dimension and location of the original wood windows.
- The siding use Option B (Hardie board) in a 4-5” exposure size, but in a color that matches the existing stucco, existing brick or as found in Color System D or E for house siding colors.
- The applicant provides HDC staff a revised plan that addresses the prior to conditions for review and approval.

Commissioner A. Johnson – SUPPORT

Ayes –4 Nay – 0 Abstain – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[06:02 pm]
00:43:47

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #22-7658 DR**

ADDRESS: 1925 Chicago

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Boston-Edison HD

APPLICANT: Frank Mastroianni

OWNER: Kevin Kendrick

SCOPE OF WORK: Erect garage

PROPOSAL: The applicant proposes to construct a 22’ x 20’ detached garage with new concrete footing/floor slab. There is no existing garage. A 5’x 25’ apron would be added to the existing driveway to join the new garage.

[06:11 pm]
00:51:28

PUBLIC COMMENT: START (AUDIO)

None

[06:11 pm]
00:51:28

END (AUDIO)

[6:06 pm]
00:46:18

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS

- Applicant present and presented a hardie-board siding alternative to the Commission.
- Commissioners expressed support for lap siding over board and baton siding for the garage.
- These changes are aligned with the staff report conditions and the Commission agrees with the staff report’s conditions.

[06:11 pm]
00:51:28

ACTION

Commissioner A. Johnson moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #22-7658 for 1925 Chicago** and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application WILL BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following conditions:

- Applicant shall replace the vinyl siding, vinyl soffits, aluminum trim and vinyl window with a historically compatible material approvable by staff.
- Applicant shall exchange the color white for windows, siding, soffits, trim and gutter with off-white or a color found in Color System D or E. This color choice shall be reviewed by staff.

Commissioner Lockhart – SUPPORT

Ayes –4 Nay – 0 Abstain – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[06:12 pm]
00:53:28

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #22-7717 JR**

ADDRESS: 1830 Church

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Corktown HD

APPLICANT: Timothy Brodoski

OWNER: Mario Dewberry

SCOPE OF WORK: Demolish portions of existing rear additions & erect a new two-story addition at rear

PROPOSAL: The applicant is seeking to rehabilitate the dwelling located at 1830 Church according to the following:

Front/South Elevation

- Remove the existing non-historic aluminum shutters at the second story,
- Remove the existing non-historic aluminum awnings at the front porch
- Remove the vinyl siding at the front porch ceiling, roof and bracket to reveal original wood elements. Repair with wood to match where necessary
- At front porch, replace existing metal railing and porch posts with new railing and porch posts
- Replace the existing historic wood front door
- Remove the existing vinyl siding and insulbrick/asphalt siding and insulation underneath to reveal the existing historic/original horizontal lapped wood siding. The original lapped wood siding will be retained and repaired
- Retain and repair existing historic wood windows

Rear/North Elevation

- At northmost/lowest addition demolish east elevation and shed-roof stair enclosure
- Add one-story rooftop addition at the existing two rear historic additions to increase their height to two stores. This will require the demolition of the existing roofs and portions of the walls at the historic-age additions. The existing vinyl siding and insulbrick/asphalt siding and insulation underneath at the historic-age

additions will be removed to reveal the existing historic/original horizontal lapped wood siding. The original lapped wood siding will be retained and repaired. The new rooftop additions will be clad with cement fiber siding

- At rear northeast corner, add a two-story addition. The new addition will be clad with cement fiber
- Erect a new two-story porch
- Two historic wood windows which are currently located at the north elevation of the home's main two mass will need to be removed as a result of the erection of the new additions. These windows will be salvaged and so that they can be installed at the home's new north elevation

Roof

- Install new dimensional asphalt shingles (color brown)
- Install new k-style, aluminum gutters and downspouts (color not specified)
- Retain existing fascia

All Elevations

- Retain and repair all existing historic wood windows
- Remove the existing vinyl siding and insulbrick/asphalt siding and insulation underneath to reveal the existing historic/original horizontal lapped wood siding. The original lapped wood siding will be retained and repaired
- Restore original brick foundation wall to match historic appearance

Site

- Remove overgrown landscaping/shrubs in front and rear of home
- Reseed grass
- Add new flowers/bushes in front and back of home (location and species of plants not specified)
- Remove existing broken concrete garage pad and replace with concrete pad (location and size not specified)

[06:28pm]

01:09:28

[06:20 pm]

01:01:28

COMMISSIONER HOSEY HAS JOINED THE MEETING

PUBLIC COMMENT: START (AUDIO)

- Tom Allenson resident in Corktown HD and about one block from the project expressed their confusion around the number of floors that was originally denied in February 24 and then approved in this application. Spoke not in favor of this application due to the significance of change to the existing house. He also expressed understanding for the removal of the garage due to the collapsed roof. He asked that the application be denied or go back to the two-story proposal (of February 24th).
- Giles Simmer, resident in Corktown HD, and two houses down from this address spoke in support of the proposal and mentioned that the garage was a safety hazard.
- Mark Crowley, resident in Corktown HD and a couple doors down from this address, spoke in support of proposal and gave some background on the house. Also spoke in favor of removal of the garage that was removed by the previous owner.

END (AUDIO)

[6:31 pm]

01:12:28

[6:18 pm]

00:59:48

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS

- Applicants present, Kelli Bailey and Mario Dewberry, agree with the staff report recommendations and will comply with them and described use of repurposed wood siding and will present landscaping site plans to staff.
- Commissioners responded to the public comment regarding the history of the application’s changes over their proposal, where their previous proposal which had two versions to modify this house, were both denied. In the interim, the applicant worked with staff to come up with the proposal that is currently before the Commission. Also, the garage is not included in this application.
- Commissioners agreed with the staff report.

[6:31 pm]
01:12:28

ACTION

Commissioner Lockhart moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #22-7717 for 1830 Church**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application **WILL BE APPROPRIATE** according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore **ISSUES a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS** for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following conditions:

- The applicant shall provide HDC staff with a final landscape/site plan for review and approval prior to the issuance of the project’s permit. If staff determines that any item is inappropriate/does not meet the Standard’s, the proposal will be submitted to the Commission for review at a future meeting.
- The applicant shall meet HDC staff with to identify an appropriate treatment for the areas of the building where the new additions meet with the historic building. If staff determines that any proposed item is inappropriate/does not meet the Standard’s, the proposal will be submitted to the Commission for review at a future meeting.

Commissioner Miriani – SUPPORT

Ayes –5 Nay – 0 Abstain – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[6:33 pm]
01:14:28

• **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #22-7660 AD**

ADDRESS: 31 Arden Park

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Arden Park- East Boston HD

APPLICANT/OWNER: Adam Hollier

SCOPE OF WORK: Erect side/rear addition

PROPOSAL: Per the submitted documents, the applicant proposes to erect an addition (27’-10” long x 11’6” wide) to the side/rear of the house to increase the size of the kitchen.

[06:42 pm]
01:23:28

PUBLIC COMMENT: START (AUDIO)

None

[06:42 pm]
01:23:28

END (AUDIO)

[6:37 pm]
01:18:28

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS

- Commissioners requested clarification regarding the planter beds and fencing.

- The applicant, Adam Hollier, is present and described the fence heights around the property and the shed on the property. Affirmed that he is ok with the staff conditions described in the staff report.
- Commissioners discuss how inappropriate work stays with the property and agree with staff report's conditions.

[6:44 pm]
01:25:28

ACTION ONE

Commissioner Miriani moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #22-7660 for 81 Arden Park**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the garden shed and 8' wood fence, as erected, **WILL NOT BE APPROPRIATE** according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore **ISSUES a DENIAL** for the proposed work.

The Commission's reason for denial is that the proposed work fails to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, specifically Standards:

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.

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.

Commissioner Lockhart – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0 Abstain – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[6:45 pm]
01:26:28

ACTION TWO

Commissioner Miriani moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #22-7660 for 31 Arden Park**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application **WILL BE APPROPRIATE** according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore **ISSUES a Certificate of Appropriateness** for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following conditions:

- The eave will be lowered so that it is well below the sunroom's stone band and will reduce the height of the wall above the windows.
- The exterior cladding will be a flat, flush metal panel with minimal joints. A warm color that coordinates with, but does not match, the buff brick will be submitted for staff review.
- The casement windows will have clear glass and no muntin patterns.
- The applicant will investigate designing the planters as an integral component of the addition. The planters will extend the length of the visible east wall.

Or catalog cuts of the proposed free-standing planters will be submitted for staff review.

- The drawings, including submission of a wall section, roof plan, and catalog cuts of the skylights, shall be revised and submitted to HDC staff for review.

Commissioner A. Johnson – SUPPORT

Ayes –5 Nay – 0 Abstain – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[6:46 pm]

01:27:28

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** #22-7661 DR

ADDRESS: 1052 Seminole

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Indian Village HD

APPLICANT/ OWNER: Phillip Cooley

ARCHITECT: Christian Hurttienne Architects

SCOPE OF WORK: Erect a rear addition

PROPOSAL: The proposed addition will serve as a mud room and family room.

Rear Porch/Rear wall Demolition, Foundation

- Remove rear porch roof, columns and foundation.
- Remove exterior brick from former exterior walls that will become interior walls, clean them and reuse for exterior walls of new addition.
- Dig and pour foundation, tie into existing foundation.

Construction of Rear Addition

- Rough frame structure
- Brick façade, install limestone coping
- Roof building with Firestone UtraPly membrane surface
- Build one (1) 21' x 3' deck and set of railings. Deck will be cedar with a clear coat finish.
- Rough electrical and cooling
- Install one (1) exterior wall sconces Y-Lighting, black/burnished bronze finish at rear door, right side.
- Install windows and doors, matching previously installed windows in 2020:
 - Install three (3) pella windows, 1 over 1, wood aluminum clad, no muntins, Architectural series, color matching existing windows. Where trim/mullions indicated, mahogany will be used and finished with Sherman Williams “seal” color to match existing trim of the house.
 - Install limestone sills at window openings.
 - Install one (1) pella doors, wood aluminum clad, glass
 - Install three (3) sliding glass doors. MATERIAL, MAKE, DESIGN TO BE CONFIRMED.

[6:51 pm]

01:32:28

PUBLIC COMMENT: START (AUDIO)

None

[6:51 pm]

01:32:28

END (AUDIO)

[6:50 pm]

01:31:28

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS

- Applicant present and accepts the Staff Report.
- Commissioners have no comment.

[6:52 pm]
01:33:28

ACTION

Commissioner Miriani moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #22-7661 for 1052 Seminole**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application WILL BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following conditions:

- The applicant provides HDC staff a dimensional elevation drawing showing locations of the exterior lights, doors and windows, and cut sheets on the sliding doors for HDC staff review and approval. Should the proposed design products and materials not be acceptable to staff, they will be returned to the Commission for further review.
- Selection of replacement bricks shall be reviewed by staff for compatibility. Replacement brick shall be field mixed with salvaged brick to create a uniform expression.

Commissioner Lockhart – SUPPORT

Ayes –5 Nay – 0 Abstain – 0

MOTION CARRIED

X CITY PROJECTS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

None

[6:53 pm]
01:34:28

XI PUBLIC COMMENT

- Amber Cecil, resident at 1527 Parker and resident in Villages neighborhood for 15 years, spoke about the Coe II development between Coe and St. Paul. She states that she went door-to-door talking to people and spoke to about many residents and started a petition, with about 196 signatures as of today, which was started last week, in opposition to this development. While acknowledging some benefits, she described a list of detriments to the community including: demolition of these small homes, too large of scale of development, stormwater, parking, etc. She would like to see a smaller scale proposal. She also described notices given within a short time-frame and within a limited range that did not include the larger community.
- The Commissioners stated they were not aware of the petition. Staff noted that the petition just received the petition today and posted it on the property website for today’s meeting, see [9029 Coe, 1500-1532 Van Dyke \(Coe II\) property page, public comment section.](#)
- Trina Fennell, is a resident across the street from the Coe II development, and spoke in opposition to this development. She states she’s not opposed to the concept of an apartment building but very opposed to the concept of destroying a historic area, while financially taking advantage of it.
- Marc Mathews, representing the Indian Village Tennis Club located at 1502 Parker St. about ½ a block from the proposed Coe II development, and owner of property adjacent to the development, which is a vacant lot on the other side of

the alley from the proposed development. The Club is opposed to this development for a couple of reasons, primarily for the material and design aesthetic of the building, which appears to skirt some of the standards of historic design. Commissioners asked if the Club supported the original Coe. Mr. Matthews stated that they did not for the same reasons stated today. Mr. Mathews was representing the Club as Vice President back then in 2016-2017.

- Scott Collins, who supports Coe II development generally, he would like to see some of the staff comments from the October 2021 HDC meeting picked up in the design, namely: the building stepping down to 3 stories as it approaches the home to the north and a larger setback from this home.
- Curt Cramer, President of the Indian Village Historical Association, observed that there are 50+ apartments and only 39 parking spaces, which they interpret meaning there must be a variance with current city code. He described an existing parking deficiency in the neighborhood and the impact it will have.
- Nick Cucinella, home owner in West Village since 2004, described his disapproval of the Coe II use of construction materials, but did not oppose development in the space.
- Penn Greene raised his sentiments regarding the two houses that are proposed for demolition as the result of the Coe II. He described how they are desirable houses and how he knew at least 5 people would be interested in purchasing the smaller of the two houses.
- Robert Lundgoot, resident at 1516 Parker for 16 years and resident in the neighborhood for about 25 years, expressed his concern regarding the character of the neighborhood, starting with Coe I, the complex on Kercheval, and now Coe II, and described his concern how it will look like a suburban neighborhood and not like the local neighborhood. He described these developments as money-makers that were not built for the love of the neighborhood.
- Michelle Potter expressed her concern for the permanent destruction of historic structures, historic character of the neighborhood, and the degradation of our infrastructure with regards to the proposed Coe II, and is in alignment with those who spoke before her.
- Amy Senese, resident on Field St. and works in the neighborhood, expressed her opposition to the Coe II development because it doesn't fit the historic nature of the neighborhood, doesn't fit in terms of the number of units, adds parking problems, and believes that they don't house Detroiters because the affordability aspect of the development is non-existent. She expressed the need to house residents that are already here.
- Carol and Robert Rhoades, residents of West Village for 40 years, raised their concerns regarding the Coe II, especially parking, the scale of the project, and also brought up a point when Coe I was approved: they said the neighborhood was eclectic and because it was eclectic just about anything could fit in the neighborhood, but Mr Rhoades stated he thinks this is wrong. He raised that they also stated that because they approved one, didn't mean that they would continue to approve the same type of building again. Mr. Rhoades described that this project is larger and even more offensive than the previous version by the same developer, right across the street. They both stated their opposition to this proposal.
- Lester Sloan, owner of home in Indian Village since 1970, suggests that this is no longer a historic district. He agrees with the previous statements regarding

new developments not being historic and the parking concerns. He stated that we should petition the State to withdraw or wipe out the historic designation for West Village. This is one of the last historic neighborhoods in the country. He listed his concerns around water, fire hazards, guard service, tax base expansion concerns, and the government.

- Nick Wilson, resident of West Village, spoke in opposition of the Coe II, where he and his wife were going to find property to purchase, but this development is a big reason to look elsewhere. Their biggest complaints include the design and materials of the building.
- Caleb Lynch, recent resident at 1522 Parker, and spoke about this historic neighbor attracted them to live here and expressed his concern regarding the Coe II, particularly expressing his concern the loss of the historic character of this neighborhood.

IX APPLICATIONS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

[7:32 pm]
02:13:28

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #22-7674 AD**

ADDRESS: 14831 Warwick

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Rosedale Park HD

APPLICANT/ OWNER: Shaunetta Cross

SCOPE OF WORK: Replace wood door with fiberglass door

PROPOSAL:

Per the submitted documents, the applicant proposes to replace the wood front entry door and steel storm door, with fiberglass entry and storm doors.

[7:32 pm]
02:13:28

COMMISSION (AND DEVELOPER) COMMENTS

- Applicant present and described the door conditions.
- Staff described the character defining features of the front door and how the front door still appeared to be still repairable before replacement of the door.
- Commissioners agree that the front door is a character-defining feature and discussed conditions of the door and confirmed their support of the staff report's assessment. They discussed a storm/security door as a potential staff-approvable option.

[7:46 pm]
02:25:28

○ **ACTION ONE**

Commissioner Hosey move that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #22-7674 for 14831 Warwick** and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed *replacement of the wood entry door* WILL NOT BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a DENIAL for the proposed work.

The Commission's reason for denial is that the proposed work fails to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, specifically Standards:

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.

5. *Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a 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.*

Commissioner A. Johnson – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[7:47 pm]

02:26:28

ACTION TWO

Commissioner Hosey move that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #22-7674 for 14831 Warwick**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed *replacement of the existing steel storm door with a new storm door, per the submitted documents* WILL BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work.

Commissioner Miriani – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[7:48 pm]

02:27:28

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** 22-7671 DR

VIOLATION NUMBERS: #248, #503

ADDRESS: 2465 Chicago

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Boston-Edison HD

APPLICANT/ PROPERTY OWNER: Hassan and Maurita Mussawwir

SCOPE OF WORK: Install vinyl windows (work completed without approval), replace doors, and other exterior work

PROPOSAL:

Staff pulled excerpts from the applicant’s narrative to identify individual scope items found within the application and received confirmation from the applicant to the scope of work. The replacement of windows with vinyl windows is work complete. Replaced forty-six (46) windows with vinyl windows. All replaced windows are Pleasantview vinyl windows, double hung or sliders with no muntins. Wood frames removed and replaced with vinyl. Brick-in rear basement exterior door, reducing rear entrances to two. The brick material is reused brick from the rear porch that is currently on the property for tuck-pointing. When needed, Belden brick, ISO 9001 & ISO 14001, “Tulip Bld” series will be used. Replace remaining four (4) exterior doors as follows:

- One (1) front door, Therma-Tru Classic-Craft Artissa Collection 3’x6’8” with Arborwatch sidelites, granite color finish.
- Three (3) rear doors, Therma-Tru Classic-Craft American fiberglass reinforced thermoset composite, entry doors, solid 6’8” height.

Replace soffits and fascia

- Wood soffits and fascia removed and replace with ACM aluminum fascia, 3105/3025-type aluminum coil sheet H26 or equivalent.

Install gutters, gutter coils, and rain barrel

- Install aluminum downspouts and gutter coils
- Install Free Garden polyethylene rain barrels

[7:49 pm]

02:28:28

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS

- The owners/applicants were present and described the background on the project and the process that they experienced. They also described how the amount of work that is yet to be done is cost prohibitive. So they ask that the Commission consider future repairs in multiple phases due to affordability. They would like to retain a certificate of occupancy so that they can live in the home while they continue to repair the house. They described how they have not been able to live in their home while doing work on the house.
- Commissioners asked confirmation of ownership of the house: November 2013. The owners received the wrong paperwork at time of purchase, and this caused further delays.
- The owners reported vandalism on their property twice.
- The Commissioners asked why they did not come for approval on the windows. The applicant states that they came with application material but then the DLBA came through and had the house on the demolition house requiring that they place windows on the house. Staff confirmed that there was no approval for window replacement on file.
- The applicants requested that the remediation for the windows be done over phases in time. The Commissioners agree that this is something that they would be amenable to do. They asked the applicant to come back with a proposal to remediate the windows violation with a timeline to help bring them back into compliance.
- Commissioners advised the applicant to focus on the areas visible from the right-of-way as primary importance and come back with a plan that has windows that are of like materiality (wood), like operation (double hung), like similar muntin patterns.
- Staff confirmed that BSEED has not placed a stop work order on this home. The applicant confirmed that they did not receive a stop work order.
- Commissioners discussed how even though the windows are in violation, the fact that the house has windows (even if vinyl) should not prevent a Certificate of Occupancy from happening with BSEED. So HDC is not the reason for any hold up on the Certificate of Occupancy.
- Commissioners discuss the design of the doors with the applicant and how the proposed door is not appropriate and encourage the applicant to work with staff to find the appropriate design.
- Commissioner asked if infill on the back door should have inset of one inch. Staff confirmed that this is not required on a rear elevation, unless the Commission deems it necessary.

[08:20 pm]

02:57:56

ACTION ONE

Commissioner Miriani moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #22-7671 for 2465 Chicago**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to

Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the replacement of wood windows with vinyl windows, the replacement of wood soffits and fascia with aluminum WILL NOT BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a DENIAL for the proposed work.

The Commission's reason for denial is that the proposed work fails to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, specifically Standards:

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 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.

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.

Commissioner Hosey– SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[08:20 pm]
02:57:56

ACTION TWO

Commissioner Miriani moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #22-7671 for 2465 Chicago**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed rear door brick-in, rear door replacements, and installation of gutters, downspouts, rain barrels, and the replacement of the front door WILL BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES A Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following conditions:

- The applicant confirm that the brick used for the rear doorway is of the same brick material of the house and the original brick around the door opening be preserved in place.

- The applicant provides the HDC staff locations and color of the downspouts and rain barrels for review and approval.
- The applicant provide the HDC staff with cutsheets for the proposed door replacement for HDC approval. If the HDC staff cannot approve the door, the applicant will have to become before the Commission to receive approval.

Commissioner Hosey– SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[08:25 pm]
03:02:56

• **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #22-7675 AP**

ADDRESS: 119 State

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Capitol Park HD

APPLICANT/OWNER: Joel Smith, Hannah – Neumann Smith / Casimer Daniewski, AFC DETROIT, LLC

ARCHITECT: Hannah – Neumann Smith

SCOPE OF WORK: Install rooftop signage; modify main entrance storefront including addition of aluminum canopy, install building-mounted flagpoles

PROPOSAL:

Per the submitted drawings and documents, the applicant is proposing multiple exterior alterations including:

- Install tenant signage at the rooftop/parapet
- Replace and modify storefront at “main entry” including the installation of a prefabricated aluminum canopy with lighting beneath canopy
- Modify storefront at “adjacent tenant” bay with the installation of a door
- Install two (2) wall-mounted outriggers with 6’ flagpoles at the vertical brick piers at the third floor

[08:26 pm]
03:03:56

COMMISSION (AND DEVELOPER) COMMENTS

- Applicant and Mike Kirk, architect, are present and confirmed that the anchor points will be within the mortar joints.
- Commissioners had no comment.

[08:28 pm]
03:05:56

ACTION

Commissioner A. Johnson moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #22-7675 for 119 State**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application **WILL BE APPROPRIATE** according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore **ISSUES** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following conditions:

- All attachment points for the canopy and outriggers shall be mounted into mortar joints and not into the masonry itself.

Commissioner Lockhart – SUPPORT

Ayes – 4 Nay – 0 Abstain – 1 (Hosey)

MOTION CARRIED

[08:32 pm]
03:09:56

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** #22-7676 AD
ADDRESS: 9000 (8920) Woodward
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Little Rock Church HD
APPLICANT: Jonathon Rollens, Lavanway Signs
PROPERTY OWNER: Little Rock Baptist Church
SCOPE OF WORK: Replace double-sided digital pylon sign (without approval) with double-sided monument sign that includes LED screens
PROPOSAL:
Per the submitted documents, the applicant proposes to remove the existing electronic sign and erect a monument sign within the same front lawn location as the existing sign.

[08:32 pm]
03:09:56

COMMISSION (AND DEVELOPER) COMMENTS

- Applicants present and Reverend Jim Holley, Pastor of the Church.
- Applicants addressed the concerns raised by the staff report including the scale of the sign, clear vision triangle, internal illumination of the sign, height above the grade, the Gothic design of the sign and the color scheme of the sign.
- The Reverend described how the timing of the sign order was placed and then there were changes to sign ordinance.
- The Commission discuss how the importance of bringing signage before the HDC for approval.
- The Commission discuss elements of the sign that might be modified to come into further compliance by simplifying the design by removing the accent details and their would be no video in the signage.

[08:54 pm]
03:31:56

ACTION

Commissioner Miriani moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #22-7676 for 9000 Woodward**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application WILL BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following conditions:

- The decorative Gothic arched detail not be applied to the signage
- The video not be displayed on the electronic message center
- The blue sign face will not be internally illuminated

Commissioner Hosey – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[08:56 pm]
03:33:56

XIII CITY PROJECTS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

None

XIV OLD BUSINESS

[08:56 pm]
03:33:56

• **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #21-7121 DR**

ADDRESS: 104 and 112 Edmund Place

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Brush Park HD

APPLICANTS/DEVELOPER: Carlo Liburdi (112 Edmund), Dominic Gillette And Gina Danetti (Co-Presidents Of 104 Edmund Place Condominium Association)

PROPERTY OWNER: Dominic Gillette And Gina Danetti (Co-Presidents Of 104 Edmund Place Condominium Association)

SCOPE OF WORK: Revise previously approved design

REVISED/ADDITIONAL WORK ITEMS:

The applicant submitted a proposal to this body for review at the March 10, 2021 Regular Meeting. The Commission approved a Certificate of Appropriateness at that meeting. **Please see/review the March 2021 COA- New Construction for the applicant's approved scope of work.** Since the March 10, 2021 meeting, the applicant has proposed to remove the previously approved five-foot, grey brick screenwall along the west side of the 112 Edmund parking area, and replace this wall with following work items for this body's consideration.

Landscape Revisions

- Retain the existing 6' metal fence between the properties of 112 and 104 Edmund, and extend the fence southward (towards the alley), stopping 10' from the alley right of way and turning into the carriage house.
- Provide vegetative screening by planting tightly spaced Upright Hetzii Juniper's and ornamental grasses on the property of 104 Edmund Pl, as shown on the accompanying landscape plan.

[08:59 pm]
03:36:56

COMMISSION (AND DEVELOPER) COMMENTS

- HDC Staff presented a review of the report.
- Applicant, Carlo Liburdi, is present and stated their disagreement with the staff report's assessment of the screen planting.
- Commissioners- No discussion or questions.

[09:03 pm]
03:40:10

ACTION

Commissioner Hosey moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #22-7121 for 104 & 112 Edmund**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application for the 6' fence and landscape planting **WILL BE APPROPRIATE** according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore **ISSUES** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work.

Commissioner Lockhart – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[09:04 pm]
03:41:10

• **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #21-7524 GL**

ADDRESS: 9029 Coe, 1500-1532 Van Dyke (Coe II)

HISTORIC DISTRICT: West Village HD

APPLICANT: Clifford A. Brown/ Coe Van Dyke 2, LLC

SCOPE OF WORK: Review of revised proposal

APPLICATION HISTORY:

At the October 13, 2021 Regular Meeting, the Commission decided to issue a Notice to Proceed for this project, including the demolition of the existing houses, which was suspended subject to design revisions to the satisfaction of the Design Review section of the Planning and Development Department, as part of the typical prong 2 NTP requirement that “the applicant proposing the work has obtained all necessary planning and zoning approvals, financing, and environmental clearances.” Furthermore, the Commission directed that the revised design be resubmitted for the Commission’s final approval. The applicant has updated the design and staff forwards with PDD’s review comments. The earlier staff report is also available on the website.

ISSUES- HISTORIC APPROPRIATENESS:

- Staff’s concern regarding the existing houses still stands, but has been rendered moot by the first round decision issuing a NTP subject to PDD design review satisfaction. Although NTP approvals are given for historically inappropriate projects, updated analysis is provided below.
- The elm tree endangered by the original proposal has been spared in the new proposal
- Overall, staff assesses that the building, updated with additional setbacks and preservation of the elm tree, now “conforms” to the Elements of Design per the ordinance and, except for the demolitions, historic staff would otherwise recommend the design be found historically appropriate, as distinct from the Commission’s NTP-based requirement to earn approval from PDD Design Staff
- PDD determined on February 24th that revisions to the project were satisfactory, and design review was approved. The suspension and administrative issuance of the NTP is contingent upon satisfaction with PDD’s review, the Commission’s approval of the final design in this meeting, as well as the other regulatory clearance as described in Section 21-2-75 (2).

[09:05 pm]
03:42:10

COMMISSION (AND DEVELOPER) COMMENTS

- HDC Staff presented a review of the report and a timeline of previous reviews before the HDC, where it was last brought before the HDC on October 13, 2021, where it was subject to public hearing at that time. At that meeting:
 - The HDC issued a Notice to Proceed, including the demolition of the two existing houses, which was immediately suspended as part of that motion was subject to design revisions to the satisfaction of the design review section of the Planning & Development Department.
 - The HDC directed that PDD, after the applicant signed off on the revised design and is available on the property page public website, is in front of the HDC this evening for your final sign-off.
- Commissioners and staff confirmed that there has not been any other activity since October on this project with regards to the HDC.
- The applicants and the PDD Deputy Director are present.
- Staff clarified that the HDC has already deemed that the project is inappropriate work back in October in 2021, because it involves the demolition of the two houses. A Notice to Proceed is only issued for inappropriate work with a

substantial community benefit. So, the Commission has already made the decision last October that the project is inappropriate.

- Staff and the PDD Deputy Director described the iterative process between the PDD, HDC staff and development design team on the revisions of the plan. They describe how many of the concerns of the Commission were addressed and believe that they have achieved a design that is more appropriate for the neighborhood.
- The Commissioners asked the PDD to further describe how the project was characterized as “decent” in its report. The Deputy Director stated that the design team used conservative language but believes the project goes beyond decent.
- The Commissioners asked the applicants to respond to the public comments, where none of it was on the approval side, and particularly address public concerns around community engagement and how they applied that to their project. The applicant stated an apology for not understanding that there might be an opportunity to bring people who are in support of the project to speak their support during the public comment period of the meeting. In addition to working with the PDD, the applicant hired a company to assist with community engagement and planned two public meetings as well as attend the West Village Association meetings. The applicant described their process and social media work and content of their meetings.
- The Commission asked the applicant to describe how they are addressing the balance of units, which are mostly single bedrooms and studios with parking spaces. The applicant confirmed that they have 37 parking spaces for 50 units, which is not a one-to-one solution. The PDD Deputy Director stated that they believe it will require a waiver, but one of the reasons why there are few parking spaces is because the developer accommodated some of the design comments that were given to them by the department, which required some reduction of parking spaces to fit within setbacks and landscape requirements. The Commission acknowledge that parking reduction is an urban design element.
- The applicant described some of the highlights of the design changes since the last design.
- The Commissioners raised concerns about the number of public comments that were raised tonight and acknowledge their feedback.
- Commissioners discuss the design changes made on the project.

[09:32 pm]
04:08:10

ACTION

Commissioner Miriani moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7524 for 9029 Coe, 1500-1532 Van Dyke (Coe II)**, that the Commission approves the removal of the hold on the October 13, 2021 approval of this application.

Commissioner Hosey – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

XV NEW BUSINESS

[09:35 pm]
04:11:10

- **Approval of Resolution 22-01- Notice to Listing Agents of Unresolved Violations at Properties**

[09:39 pm]
04:15:10

Commissioner Miriani motioned to approve Resolution 22-01

Commissioner Hosey – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[09:40 pm]
04:16:10

XVI ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Miriani motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 pm.

Commissioner Hosey – SUPPORT

Ayes – 4 Nay – 1 (Hamilton)

MOTION CARRIED

MEETING ADJOURNED

LIST OF ACRONYMS

- Building Safety Engineering, and Environmental Department (BSEED)
- Historic District (HD)
- Historic District Advisory Board (HDAB)
- Historic District Commission (HDC)
- HDC Staff
 - AD- Audra Dye
 - AP- Ann Phillips
 - BC- Brendan Cagney
 - DR- Dan Rieden
 - GL- Garrick Landsberg
 - JR – Jennifer Ross
- Planning & Development Department (PDD)