

**DETROIT HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**

**Date: June 10, 2020**

**Due to COVID-19 restrictions, this meeting was held electronically via Zoom Meeting Link**

**I. Commissioner Hamilton called the meeting to order at 5:38 pm.**

**II. ROLL CALL**

	ABSENT	PRESENT		ABSENT	PRESENT
Dennis Miriani, Vice Chair	_____	<u>  X  </u>	Katie Johnson	<u>  X  </u>	_____
James Hamilton, Chair	_____	<u>  X  </u>	Richard Hosey	<u>  X  </u>	_____
Alease Johnson	_____	<u>  X  </u>	Jessica McCall	_____	<u>  X  </u>
Tiffany Franklin	_____	<u>  X  </u>			
 Staff					
Jennifer Ross, PDD	_____	<u>  X  </u>	Taylor Leonard, Law Dept.	<u>  X  </u>	_____
Brendan Cagney, PDD	_____	<u>  X  </u>	Pamela Parrish, Law Dept.	_____	<u>  X  </u>
Ann Phillips, PDD	_____	<u>  X  </u>			
Garrick Landsberg, PDD	_____	<u>  X  </u>	Jennifer Reinhardt, HDAB	_____	<u>  X  </u>
Audra Dye, PDD	_____	<u>  X  </u>	Rebecca Savage, HDAB	_____	<u>  X  </u>

**III. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Commissioner Alease Johnson asked the following projects to be moved to the Consent Agenda:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| #20-6748 & #20-6746 – 2915 John R,<br>69 & 95 Edmund Place – Brush Park HD | Enlarge Existing Parking Lot, Courtyard<br>Alteration, New Parking Lot              |
| #20-6734 – 3360 Charlevoix – Franklin-Settlements HD                       | Replace Front Stair with Revised Design,<br>Restore Masonry Walls, Repaint Exterior |
| #20-6736 – 1505 Longfellow – Boston Edison HD                              | Expand Window Opening; Replace Non-<br>Historic Window with Two New Windows         |

Commissioner Miriani – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5      Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

Commissioner Franklin moved to APPROVE the Agenda as modified.

Commissioner Alease Johnson – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5      Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**IV. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Commissioner Miriani made a motion to APPROVE the May 13, 2020 meeting minutes.

Commissioner Franklin – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5      Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**V. APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA**

Commissioner Miriani made a motion to APPROVE the following projects, with staff recommendations and conditions (if present):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| #20-6748 & #20-6746 – 2915 John R,<br>69 & 95 Edmund Place – Brush Park HD | Enlarge Existing Parking Lot, Courtyard<br>Alteration, New Parking Lot              |
| #20-6734 – 3360 Charlevoix – Franklin-Settlements HD                       | Replace Front Stair with Revised Design,<br>Restore Masonry Walls, Repaint Exterior |

#20-6736 – 1505 Longfellow – Boston Edison HD

Expand Window Opening; Replace Non-Historic Window with Two New Windows

Commissioner Alease Johnson – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5           Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**VI. POSTPONED APPLICATION**

None

**XII. EFFECTS OF CITY OR CITY-ASSISTED PROJECTS (ADVISORY DETERMINATIONS)**

None

**VIII. APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING**

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** 20-6728

**ADDRESS:** 888 LONGFELLOW

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** BOSTON-EDISON

**APPLICANT:** ROBERT MURRAY

**OWNER:** ROBERT MURRAY

**SCOPE OF WORK:** ERECT NEW GARAGE, REPLACE DRIVEWAY, ERECT NEW FENCE AT REAR YARD

**PROPOSAL**

With the current proposal, the applicant is seeking the Commission’s approval to erect a new garage, replace concrete driveway, and erect new fence at rear yard. Included in the proposal are the following scope items:

- Remove existing driveway and garage pad in its entirety. Pour new concrete driveway, driveway apron, and garage pad. New driveway is to match existing “two-track” driveway and the driveway apron is to be 24’ wide and is proposed to include (2) 6’ W x 16’ L parking engineered gravel areas to help with drainage. The gravel areas are to be located directly adjacent (south) to the vehicle entrance of the garage. The new garage pad and footings will be constructed per code for a new 24’ x 24’ garage.
- Erect new 24’ x 24’ garage located at the northwest corner of the lot. Garage materials to include:
  - Panelized fiber cement “mortarless” brick veneer (Color: Alexandria Buff) cladding at front (south) elevation the body of the garage only.
  - Smooth Lap Hardie Plank siding with 7” reveal at gable end of front (south) façade and at the body of the garage at all elevations other than the front elevation. Siding to be painted to match the existing house.
  - Trim to be 1” x 6” smooth fiber cement.
  - Hipped roof to be covered in architectural singles and will match those at the existing house
  - Gutters are to match those at the existing house
  - Garage door to be panelized 16’W x 7’H insulated steel garage door with divided lites along the top of the door (color: white).
  - Person door located at the east elevation to be a 36” x 80” gray fire primed steel door.
  - Wall sconce lighting proposed
- Install a new 6’ tall cedar privacy fence at north and west property lines to match the existing cedar fence along the east property line. Fence along west property line will stop at rear façade of existing house.
- Install 8’ wide cedar swinging gate at side driveway entrance.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENT:**

- HDC Staff Reporter, Ann Phillips, notified the Commission of the revised drawings the applicant submitted (and were forwarded to the Commission) in reaction to the staff conditions within the staff report.

- *The applicant stated that he would prefer to build a garage with a simple gable.*

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None

**ACTION**

Commissioner Alease Johnson moved:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of Application #20-6728 for 888 Longfellow Street, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Sections 21-2-73/21-2-78 of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determine that the proposed work will be appropriate according to the defined Elements of Design for the historic district and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (36 CFR Part 67), and therefore issues a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work.

The COA is issued with the following conditions:

- The new design option for the garage, with the simpler roofline, is to be used.
- The cladding of the garage is to be of a single material.
  - If the applicant chooses to use brick as the material, it must be a true masonry (with mortar) product.
  - If the applicant chooses to use Hardie Board material, it must mimic historic wood siding in surface treatment, corner details, depth of profile and dimension of reveal.
- Paint color selections are to complement the existing house.
- The applicant shall revise the drawing set/construction documents to reflect the updated roof form, material selections, and paint color selections

Commissioner Franklin – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5      Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** 20-6733

**ADDRESS:** 421 WATSON

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** BRUSH PARK

**APPLICANT:** BILL PURSIFULL, ST. CLAIR CONSTRUCTION COMPANY

**OWNERS:** MIKE ESIAN, OWNER REPRESENTATIVE, BRUSH WILKINS 2017 LLC

**SCOPE:** REHAB BUILDING, EXPAND WINDOW OPENINGS, REPLACE WINDOWS, RAISE ROOF LINE FOR CLERESTORY WINDOWS

**PROPOSAL**

The current proposal for exterior work seeks to completely rehab the building, raise the roof line of the building by two (2) feet to create clerestory fenestration, expand many of the existing window openings and create new window openings on the front facade. The detailed scope of work is as follows:

**General Façade rehabilitation**

- Existing masonry to be restored by using mild cleaners and soft-bristle brushes to remove staining and discoloration. Power washers will not be used on exterior surfaces.
- Tuck-pointing of deteriorated mortar joints to be repointed.
- Restore existing metal railings by cleaning the surface to remove existing paint, rust, and metal burs with medium-bristle wire hand brushes and files, as needed. Railings will then be repainted.
- Install gutters and downspouts (material cut sheets not supplied).

**Replace Windows and doors / Modify Existing Window Openings**

- For all replacement windows, the applicant proposes to install Quaker H-600 Aluminum Simulated Divided Lite Casement Windows with exterior grids, painted black.
- South Elevation:
  - Replace the existing 48” x 66” casement window with new Quaker Aluminum Simulated Divided Lite

- Casement Windows, exterior muntin pattern to match existing, painted black.
- Create two (2) new 48”x 66” window openings –left and right of the existing casement window
- Expand existing front door opening to 12’-0” x 5’4”, existing doorway opening dimensions not provided.
- Install Commercial glass door between transom fenestration system, wood frame with glass panel.
- Create two (2) new 4’x16’ window openings –left and right of the center entrance door
  - Install two (2) 4’x16’ Quaker H-600 Aluminum Simulated Divided Lite Casement Windows, exterior muntin pattern to match existing, painted black, as proposed.
  - Tooth in brick to match existing masonry at existing door opening.
- East Elevation:
  - Expand five (5) existing window openings from approximately 4’x5’-6” to 4’x12’
    - Install five (5) 4’x12’ Quaker H-600 Aluminum Simulated Divided Lite Casement Windows, exterior muntin pattern to match existing, painted black, as proposed.
  - Install five (5) 4’ x 2’ fixed casement windows as proposed, Quaker H-600 series.
- West elevation:
  - Expand four (4) existing window openings from approximately 4’x5’-6” to 4’x12’
    - Install four (4) 4’x12’ Quaker H-600 Aluminum Simulated Divided Lite Casement Windows, exterior muntin pattern to match existing, painted black, as proposed.
  - Fill in existing window and install new 7’-0” x 6’-0” double doorway at location of proposed ramp for ADA access.
- North Elevation:
  - Replace the existing 48” x 66” casement window with new Quaker Aluminum Simulated Divided Lite Casement Windows, exterior muntin pattern to match existing, painted black.
  - Fill in existing window openings with matching brick.
  - Create new doorway.
  - Replace existing basement door.

**Install new ADA Ramp on West Elevation**

- The applicant proposes to install a new ADA ramp. Exact dimensions, material and finish not specified.

**Roof**

- The applicant proposes to install a new, metal gable style roof system that will create a 2’ band of new fenestration at the roof line.
- The proposed gable roof will span approximately half the length of the building, the flat portion of the roof will be replaced with typical EPDM membrane treatment.
- Plans show HVAC equipment installed on the flat portion of the roof.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENT:**

- Commissioner Franklin asked the status of the cross.
  - The applicant said it will be removed as the building will not be used as a church. It is possible it may be displayed within the building, but that may not be appropriate with the future use.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- *Steven Halmaghi, Brush Park Resident* – Expressed support for the project.

**ACTION**

Commissioner McCall moved:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of Application #20-6733 for 421 Watson Street, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Sections 21-2-73/21-2-78 of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determine that the proposed work will be appropriate according to the defined Elements of Design for the historic district and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (36 CFR Part 67), and therefore issues a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness was issued with the following conditions:

- Staff has the opportunity to review final plans, cut sheets for doors, railings, ramp, and brick sample.
- Windows that are bricked in will be inset 1/2"- 1" to preserve original window configuration.

Commissioner Franklin – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5           Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** 20-6737

**ADDRESS:** 2827 JOHN R & 105 ALFRED

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** BRUSH PARK

**APPLICANT:** AJ RILEY, MICHAEL BRAHLER, OOMBRA ARCHITECTS

**PROPERTY OWNER:** MICHAEL VANOVERBEKE

**SCOPE:** REVISION TO PREVIOUSLY-APPROVED DESIGN, TO INCLUDE AN ADDITIONAL STORY AT 2827 JOHN R; DEMOLISH EXISTING BUILDING AT 2827 JOHN R; AND REDUCE THE WIDTH AND NUMBER OF 105 ALFRED

**PROPOSAL**

The applicant attended this body’s 06-13-2018 regular meeting and submitted a proposal for new construction within the district, which included the rehab and integration of the existing building/carriage house remains at 2827 John R into a new 4-story building and a substantial new 4-story residential/parking garage addition, to be located at 105 Alfred. Specifically, the 2018 application proposed the following:

The existing building envelope at 2827 John R. will be retained, cleaned, and repaired where necessary with brick to match the historic appearance. New windows and doors will be added to the original carriage house. Existing window openings at the flat-roof portion of the building will be enlarged, and new aluminum upward-folding doors will be installed. The existing building envelope will be incorporated into a new 4-story building. Walls, insulated wood windows, and insulated folding wood door curtain wall systems. Integral balconies and soffit are projecting and will be clad with zinc panels. Charred, slatted cedar screens will provide visual interest. Glass panel railing will be located at the balconies. A one-story mass will be erected to connect the existing, historic building to a new 4-story garage/residential addition to be located at 105 Alfred. The new 4-story garage/residential addition will be primarily clad with glazed brick. Charred cedar vertical wood panels will be employed to screen the garage openings at the 4th story, rear, and side elevation. The front elevation, which is located at the residential liner, will feature aluminum windows and doors. Finally, an outdoor patio area will be established to the south of the new building.

The Commission issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for the above-outlined rehab of the shell of the existing building at 2827 John R., the new construction/building at 2827 John R, and the new construction/new garage and residential wings at 105 Alfred.

With the current submission, the applicant is seeking the Commission’s approval to revise the previously-approved work at 2827 John R and 105 Alfred to include the following:

**105 Alfred Street**

- Reduce the width of the parking structure by 12’-0” (at the west elevation), which will result in the removal of 12 parking spaces and a total of 8,200 SF. The rear parking deck structure’s height will be increased from 42’-0” to 44’-6” and the stair tower height will be increased by approximately 15’-0” (in conjunction with the additional story proposed for the 2827 John R. Street building)

**2827 John R Street**

- While retaining the shell of the ca. 1880s original carriage house wing, rebuild the collapsed brick gable at the east elevation with a new gable, which will be clad with metal panel. The 2018 application proposed to rebuild the collapsing gable using brick to match the existing

- Demolish the one-story flat-roof ca. 1925 brick one-story shop addition and the ca.1945 brick and concrete block, one-story shop addition and erect a new one-story building which will extend an additional 11'-0" the south. The exterior shall be clad with metal panels and storefronts will be aluminum (cutsheets not provided). An outdoor seating area to the south of the building will be sheltered by a flat-roofed canopy. The 2018 application proposed to retain/rehabilitate the shell of the ca. 1925 and ca. 1945 additions and integrate them within the new building.
- Erect an additional story to accommodate three new residential units (at the new level 5). The second-story open rooftop patio originally proposed in 2018 will be removed as the building's front elevation will be expanded to the east to accommodate a new 2nd story commercial space. The entire building (stories 1-5) will be extended 11'-0" to the south. The 2018 application proposed the erection of a 4-story rooftop addition as described above.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- *Jeff Cowin, Brush Park Resident* – Read a portion of the letter drafted by the Brush Park Community Development Corporation which stated it does not support the project. While overall enthusiastic about the overall design, all access to parking should match the existing lots on Alfred and be entered to and from the alley.
- *Janessa Manning, Brush Park Resident* – Does not support the project. She concurred the parking lot entrance should not be on Alfred; it should be on John R which is the busier street. She also said the setback of this development does not match the historic setbacks.
- *Marc Herrick, Brush Park Resident* – He expressed his biggest concern is with the setback. He suggested the 12-foot reduction for the west side of the structure instead be taken off the south side. The additional 12-feet will be great benefit to the district and would approach the historic setbacks and will help it not be so dominant and over-powering to the district by being that close to the sidewalk.
- *Steven Halmaghi, Brush Park Resident* – Expressed support for the project. He said the senior housing development under Bedrock has the same setback as this development. On Alfred, there is a garage entrance in the other Bedrock development on the corner of Brush and Alfred where the entrance to the underground garage is through Alfred Street; the alleyway is not utilized in that development. He asked the project architect for additional information on why the alley was not used for the parking lot.
- *Marc Herrick, Brush Park Resident* – He added a comment that his understanding of setbacks is that they are in reference to the buildings on the same side of the street as the development and not those on the other side of the street.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENT:**

- Commissioner Hamilton informed all attendees that the parking structure, entrances, and setback were approved as part of the original review and are not part of the current application. While they may be continuing concerns of the residents, there is nothing in the current application that bears on those topics. The current scope for the Commission is with the building that faces John R.
- Commissioner Miriani said, regarding the staff recommendations, he is leaning towards agreement that the other two buildings do not have to be incorporated into their plan, based on their condition and where they are relative to the historic nature of the carriage house project. Similar to looking at the church application, this is a unique space that can catalyze additional development on adjacent parcels. Adding a constraint to making this a viable project would be detrimental, therefore he supports the applicant's request to remove that condition from the Commission's approval.
- Commissioner Alease Johnson would like to know if there was consideration to retain the other buildings.
- Commissioner Miriani said, based on the presentation, it is his understanding the current structural deterioration would not allow them to be retained. Rather they would need to be demolished and rebuilt, and at that time these additional buildings would no longer be considered historic.

**ACTION**

Commissioner Miriani moved:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of Application #20-6737 for 2827 John R & 105 Alfred Street, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Sections 21-2-73/21-2-78 of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determine that the proposed work will be appropriate according to the defined Elements of Design for the historic district and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (36 CFR Part 67), and therefore issues a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness was issued with the following conditions:

- The east elevation gable shall be rebuilt using brick to match the building's historic appearance/the gable at the north end.
- Staff shall be afforded the opportunity to review and approve the final project design.

Commissioner McCall – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5            Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** 20-6729

**ADDRESS:** 229 & 239 EDMUND PLACE

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** BRUSH PARK

**APPLICANT:** DOUG QUADA, NEW BEGINNINGS LAND DEVELOPMENT, LLC

**PROPERTY OWNER:** DOUG QUADA, NEW BEGINNINGS LAND DEVELOPMENT, LLC

**SCOPE:** REVISION TO PREVIOUSLY-APPROVED DESIGN OF NEW GARAGE; ADD NEW LANDSCAPING AT SIDELOT

**PROPOSAL**

The applicant attended this body's 03-18-2018 regular meeting and submitted a proposal to rehabilitate the dwelling at 229 Edmund Place, to include the erection of a rear addition, and to erect a new garage/carriage house to the rear of the existing home. The Commission approved the applicant's proposal. With the current submission, the owner is seeking the Commission's approval of a number of revisions to the previously-approved application. The applicant is also seeking approval to enlarge the approved new garage at 229 Edmund Place so that the structure extends into the adjacent lot, which is addressed as 239 Edmund Place. New landscaping and hardscaping are also proposed for installation at the adjacent lot/239 Edmund Place. Specifically, as per the applicant, the current proposal includes the following:

**Revisions to elements approved at 229 Edmund Place in 2018** • New Revision: Install a new slate roof in standard rectangular and clipped corner patterns. Slate roof color in grey/green as well as royal purple and red highlights  
○ Approved in 2018: Install a new slate roof in diamond pattern in grey/green color at the existing building and new rear addition • New Revision: 5' setback at west/side yard for rear addition due to an unnoticed drafting error  
○ Approved in 2018: 3' setback at west/side yard for rear addition • New Revision: Erect a new garage/carriage house to the rear of the existing home. The overall dimensions shall measure 23'-6" x 75'-5" with a roof height of 25'-8". A deck will be established at the building's rooftop.  
○ Approved in 2018: Erect a new garage/carriage house to the rear of the existing home. The overall dimensions shall measure 23'-4" x 55'-6" with a roof height of 21'-0" and a 5'x13'-8" bump-out at the front elevation.

**Install New Landscape and Hardscape at 239 Edmund Place**

Install Azek permeable paver driveway and parking lot area (4 spaces maximum) • Install new patio, fire table and seat-wall area • Install deciduous and non-deciduous trees, in addition to perennial plantings as per the submitted site plan  
Install new concrete walkway

**Erect New Fence at 229 and 239 Edmund Place**

As per the submitted site plan, erect a new fence which consists of brick columns (16" square, 5'-high) and black iron fencing (see attached for style) to measure 4'-high at front property line and the east and west property lines, at the southern end of the parcels/to the front face of the existing home at 229 Edmund Place, to enclose front yard area. The fence's will be aluminum and shall measure 6' at east and west property lines,

from the front face of the existing home at 229 Edmund Place extending north to enclose the property's side and rear yards (height at rear property line not specified).

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None

**COMMISSIONER COMMENT:**

None

**ACTION**

Commissioner Franklin moved:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of Application #20-6729 for 229 & 239 Edmund Place, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Sections 21-2-73/21-2-78 of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determine that the proposed work will be appropriate according to the defined Elements of Design for the historic district and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (36 CFR Part 67), and therefore issues a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness was issued with the following conditions:

- HDC staff shall be afforded the opportunity to review and approve the final brick choice for the columns proposed for the new fence.

Commissioner Alease Johnson – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5      Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**IX. CITY PROJECTS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING**

None

**X. APPLICATIONS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING**

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** 20-6748 (INCLUDING 20-6746)

**ADDRESS:** 2915 JOHN R STREET, 69 & 95 EDMUND PLACE

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** BRUSH PARK

**APPLICANT:** PIERRE HARICK, JOHN EDMUND STREET, LLC.

**PROPERTY OWNER:** PIERRE HARICK

**SCOPE:** ENLARGE EXISTING PARKING LOT, COURTYARD ALTERATION, NEW PARKING LOT

**PROPOSAL**

The applicant is requesting the following items for review:

**2915 JOHN R**

Parking Lot

- Remove deteriorated asphalt parking area on the North and West side of the building (31 parking spaces)
- Lay new asphalt parking area on the North and West side of the building, including:
  - New striping
  - New greenspace on the north side of the John R entrance
  - Modification/reduction in size of the landscaped courtyard to create an additional (five) parking spots, two of which will be ADA-accessible

Courtyard

- Removal of the pond structure, concrete pad, and sidewalks.
- Creation of greenspace
- New sidewalks and curb to be poured
  - A ramp will connect the ADA-parking spots to the sidewalk.

- A new sidewalk is proposed to bisect the courtyard, creating a path from the parking lot to the rear courtyard wall of the building. While the current entrance to the building from the courtyard is down a flight of stairs, this walkway takes into account possible future plans for more entrances should ground floor services be added within the building.
- No free-standing lighting is planned. There are three existing lights in the courtyard illuminating the pathway to the staircase and the staircase itself. There are several units that have windows that face the courtyard, so enough light was put there to provide visibility but not be blinding.

## **69 & 95 EDMUND**

### Parking Lot

- The gravel lot will be leveled, concrete curbs will be poured, and an asphalt topcoat will be applied on top of 8-inches of compact 21AA (aggregate), creating 32 parking spaces.
- The entire lot for 95 Edmund will be used for the new parking lot. Thirty-five (35) feet of 69 Edmund (the western portion of the parcel) was sold and is not included in the parking plan, allowing for a substantial distance between the parking lot and the adjacent structure. The distance between the adjacent structure and its front property line is 7.3 feet, whereas the distance between the parking spaces and its property line is 5 feet.
- The existing gate at 95 Edmund will be replaced with a sliding gate; the existing curb cut will continue to be used and the existing fencing will remain intact.
- The lot includes greenspaces at the entrance as well as the western edge of the lot, and a landscaped buffer will be installed within the five-foot setback between the fence and the parking spaces. Burning trees, boxwoods, berberis and spiraeas, to provide some color to the area, will be planted.

## **ACTION**

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of Application #20-6748 for 2915 John R, and Application #20-6746 for 69 & 95 Edmund Place, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Sections 21-2-73/21-2-78 of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determine that the proposed work will be appropriate according to the defined elements of design for the historic district and the Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation and guidelines for rehabilitating historic buildings (36 CFR Part 67), and therefore issues a certificate of appropriateness for the proposed work.

## **APPROVED PER CONSENT AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** 20-6633  
**ADDRESS:** 1681 – 1683 ATKINSON  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** ATKINSON AVENUE  
**APPLICANT:** JOY CRANSHAW and KYLIE  
**SCOPE:** REPLACE EXISTING WOOD WINDOWS

## **PROPOSAL**

With the current proposal, the applicant is seeking the Commission's approval to replace (8) existing vinyl single hung windows and (26) historic wood double hung and casement windows with new composite (reclaimed wood fiber and thermoplastic polymer fused together) windows of single hung and fixed operation. Included in the proposal are the following scope items:

- Remove (8) existing vinyl single hung windows and associated vinyl trim/wrap in their entirety and replace with new Anderson 100 series composite (reclaimed wood fiber and thermoplastic polymer) single hung windows with simulated divided lite upper sashes (3 vertical lites/1). Any existing wood trim remaining beneath aluminum or vinyl trim/wrap to be repaired and retained. If wood is beyond repair, damaged pieces will be replaced in kind with wood.
- Remove (20) existing wood double hung windows and aluminum storms in their entirety and replace with Anderson 100 Series composite single hung windows. Remove (6) existing wood casement windows and aluminum storms in their entirety and replace with Anderson 100 Series composite fixed

windows. All existing trim and brick mold to remain unless deteriorated beyond repair in which case the trim/brick mold will be replaced in kind with wood.

- Wood divided lite attic windows are to remain at this time.
- All replacement windows to be finished in “Dark Bronze” color on exterior.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENT:**

- Commissioner Miriani asked if the applicant obtained a quote for wood windows, as well as for the repair of the existing windows.
- The Commission requested the contractor who did the assessment of the original wood windows to participate in the review, either by a written report (detailing the condition of each window and scope of the repair work) or by participating in the Commission’s review at an upcoming meeting.
- The Commission also requested sash samples, and/or side-cut drawings for the proposed windows so the Commission can determine how well the new windows will match the profile of the old. Dimensions
- Commissioner Hamilton commented on the proposed staff condition regarding the possible muntin patterns. As there is no visual record of the house prior to the designation photo (which shows one-over-one sash), and not to be falsely historic, it would be best to have one-over-one windows.

**ACTION**

The Commission confirmed the existing application is incomplete and asked the applicants to come back with the requested information at a future meeting.

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** 20-6709

**ADDRESS:** 3360 CHARLEVOIX

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** FRANKLIN WRIGHT SETTLEMENTS

**APPLICANT:** AHMAD NASSAR

**PROPERTY OWNER:** FRANKLIN WRIGHT SETTLEMENTS

**SCOPE:** REPLACE FRONT STAIR WITH REVISED DESIGN; RESTORE MASONRY WALLS, EXTERIOR PAINTING

**PROPOSAL**

Per the applicant’s submitted scope of work and construction drawings, the project will encompass the following items:

- Scrape all loose paint.
- Inspect the façade and make necessary repairs to masonry veneer utilizing standard concrete masonry units (CMU) and necessary tuckpointing at missing mortar joints, to prevent further water infiltration.
- Power wash the entire exterior of the building.
- Prime new and exposed masonry.
- Provide (2) Coats of Sherwin Williams A100 Exterior Paint (includes accent bands with colors picked by owner).
- Completely remove main entry stairs and replace per post bid documents provided. (Contractor confirmed the existing wingwalls will remain.)
- *Per the submitted plans:* Concrete stairs will be constructed below-grade at the rear elevation of the gymnasium. A vertical metal railing will be installed to close-off the stairs from the playground.

**ACTION**

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of Application #20-6734 for 3360 Charlevoix Street, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Sections 21-2-73/21-2-78 of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determine that the proposed work will be appropriate according to the defined elements of design for the historic district and the Secretary of the Interior’s standards for rehabilitation and guidelines for rehabilitating historic buildings (36 CFR Part 67), and therefore issues a certificate of appropriateness for the proposed work.

The COA was issued with the following conditions:

- The applicant will submit the final color scheme for staff review.
- The final selection for the front stair railing and rear stair guard rail (specifying design, dimensions, material, and color) shall be submitted for staff review.

**APPROVED PER THE CONSENT AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** 20-6736

**ADDRESS:** 1504 LONGFELLOW

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** BOSTON EDISON

**APPLICANT:** ALYSE WESORICK

**OWNER:** ALYSE WESORICK

**SCOPE:** EXPAND WINDOW OPENING; REPLACE NON-HISTORIC WINDOW WITH TWO NEW WINDOWS

**PROPOSAL**

With the current proposal, the applicant is seeking the Commission’s approval to expand existing window opening at rear addition and replace non-historic window with (2) new windows. Included in the proposal are the following scope items:

Remove existing 26”W x 36”H double hung wood window and trim in its entirety • Enlarge rough opening to 70”W x 57”H • Install (2) new 32”W x 57”H Anderson 400 series vinyl clad wood double hung windows divided by a 6” mullion in the newly enlarged opening. Opening is to be trimmed with wood to match existing configurations on the adjacent sunroom. Window exterior and trim is to be painted brown (B:8) to match existing. • The replacement windows are proposed to include “colonial style” muntin patterns between the glass at the upper sash, creating the appearance of a 6/1 window.

**ACTION**

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of Application #20-6736 for 1504 Longfellow Street, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Sections 21-2-73/21-2-78 of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determine that the proposed work will be appropriate according to the defined elements of design for the historic district and the Secretary of the Interior’s standards for rehabilitation and guidelines for rehabilitating historic buildings (36 CFR Part 67), and therefore issues a certificate of appropriateness for the proposed work.

With the following conditions:

- The replacement windows are to be wood, or aluminum-clad wood rather than vinyl-clad wood.
- The light configuration is to be 1/1 without muntins in either sash.
- The applicant shall revise the submission to reflect the updated replacement window product and light configuration and submit to HDC staff for review and approval prior to pulling the building permit for the project.

**APPROVED PER CONSENT AGENDA**

**XI. APPLICATIONS FOR WORK INITIATED /COMPLETED WITHOUT HDC APPROVAL (VIOLATIONS)**

None

**XII. OLD BUSINESS**

None

**XIII NEW BUSINESS**

**REPORTS**

**Historic District Commission, Garrick Landsberg**

Re-Opening the Office

BSEED, at some level of staffing, will open on July 6<sup>th</sup>. Planning Department officials are in discussion with BSEED officials to determine if/when/how HDC staff may return to the office and/or continue working remotely.

Staff Hours

Staff continues to work at reduced weekly hours (32 hours/week). Field inspections and staff visits will likely become required before the next meeting.

School Study

Staff continues to document the schools, two days a week, for the school study.

DTE

Residents in districts still have questions regarding work being done. DTE will likely attend the July meeting to come to a new resolution, recapture the 2013 resolutions, and renew the agreement.

Rules of Procedure

The Rules of Procedure are being revised based on the Commission's first review and should be ready for a second review at the July meeting.

HDAB

Next meeting is tomorrow. One agenda item of note is the final vote for the Eastern Market Local Historic District, during which the borders will be confirmed.

July 8, 2020 Meeting

He informed the Commissioners a major project with a great deal of complexity will be heard for the first time as an advisory review.

**OFFICER ELECTIONS**

Elections are needed for the positions of Chair and Vice Chair, which will run from now until February 2021. A Commissioner can put forth a name.

Commissioner Alease Johnson moved to postpone the officer elections.

Commissioner McCall – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5        Nays – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

*Katy Trudeau, Deputy Director, Planning and Development, joined the meeting.*

*Arthur Jemison, Group Executive, Planning, Housing and Development, joined the meeting.*

**RESOLUTION**

Mr. Landsberg stated the staff authored resolution, which Commissioner McCall introduced, would allow for expedited permitting in local historic districts, specifically to allow the alteration of exterior environments in direct response to the COVID epidemic. The City authored guidelines that lay out a process where a restaurant owner can sign up their address and obtain automatic approval if their plan is consistent with the guidelines. Due to the Michigan Historic Preservation Act, the City cannot suspend the permitting requirement in local historic districts; this resolution would accomplish this need.

Mr. Landsberg went on to say, the third paragraph limits the resolution to the COVID situation: 1) it gives staff authority to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for historically appropriate modifications, and 2) asks to issue a blanket Notice To Proceed (NTP) under Condition 4 (whereas the project is in the interest of the majority of the community), for inappropriate applications. Per the ordinance, an NTP can only be issued if the work is found inappropriate – examples include the installation of plexiglass shields, use of 2 x 4's, etc. Also, there is a sunset clause of November 30, unless extended by the Historic District Commission (coordinating with the City's guidelines).

Mr. Jemison explained due to the 50% occupancy requirement within a restaurant, they would need to operate at a lower level of occupancy and then have lower than breakeven/no profitability. By using outdoor space, it gives the opportunity to operate closer to breakeven, or possibly achieve a profit. They can allow social distancing and have the required number of "tops".

Mr. Jemison said Council delegated all its jurisdiction, including street closures, to the Department of Public Works (DPW). It is important to note, upon the restaurant filling out a detailed questionnaire, including did they have outdoor seating last year, they get a provisional approval. Then, BSEED, DPW and the Health Department go out and do a site visit to confirm the arrangement is safe and conforms to the guidelines, and if corrections are required.

Ms. Trudeau stated that during this pandemic she has participated in many calls with Planning Departments across the country. Other cities are pursuing this strategy, and some are even considering permanent street closures.

Mr. Landsberg added HDC staff want owners in local historic districts to be included in this process and not be caused delays. He confirmed HDC staff would also conduct site visits to determine appropriateness.

Commissioner Johnson said this is smart and necessary to do.

Ms. Ross reminded the Commissioners staff currently has authority to issue COAs for outdoor dining, with the requirement the installation comes down at the end of the café season. The condition is in the resolution and not the COA.

Commissioner Hamilton asked what BSEED is doing about building permits for these installations.

Mr. Jemison said BSEED is issuing standard outdoor café permits. They are not waiving any of the fees, but they are considering this if a source is found to cover the fees. BSEED will still conduct standard inspections in the same manner as in the past, the only difference is the owner gets a provisional permit before an inspection.

As many Commissioners expressed concern over the non-expiration of COAs for outdoor cafes within this resolution, Ms. Taylor (Law Department) suggested the owners only get approval if the installation is only for a single season.

Ms. Ross commented there is a sunset date on the City ordinance. If DPW goes back to Council for an extension, HDC staff would do the same with the Commission.

The Law Department agreed they can develop the appropriate language to capture the Commission's concerns about the expiration of outdoor approvals (whether it is with a COA or an NTP).

Commissioner Franklin moved the HDC adopt Resolution 20-02 with the condition that the language in the fourth paragraph be modified by the Law Department to capture the spirit of discussion within this meeting relative to any projects applying for permits this season, and that a sunset date of November 30<sup>th</sup> be enacted for a COA (as well as for the NTP).

Miriani – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5            Nays – 0

**RESOLUTION PASSED**

**RULES OF PROCEDURE REVISIONS**

Tabled to the July meeting.

**VIOLATIONS**

Mr. Landsberg told the Commission one of the main concerns staff has had is how periodic inspections would be handled in the districts. The way staff is looking to frame the program is with the understanding that there are violations of all different types, there are different intensities of violations, different levels of culpability (by current owners, previous owners, owners we have no record of), and the HDC’s own records of COAs are not complete for some years. There are a number of issues.

Connected with this role are the “hot” violations, in other words the active violations; violations that are being brought to staff attention at this moment. The process around those, in staff’s opinion, have also not been consistent. We have more violations identified near staff and Commissioner houses. This needs to be an equitable program. Additionally we don’t want to embark on this program without reviewing and obtaining the political support, including the Planning Department, Department of Neighborhoods (DON), City Council; there are a lot of other stakeholders to bring on board if we are going to build and manage this program.

In March we were on the verge of hiring an additional staff member, which we lost due to the pandemic.

The idea is to make periodic inspections. A map of the city has been divided by city council district. Staff will survey street by street, block by block. Letters will be mailed giving owners notice that a violation was identified, and that the city does not have record of its approval. We will request they present a COA (giving them 90 days to provide this documentation). If they are not able to do so, they will be docketed after 120 days to attend a violation meeting.

To reiterate: Not everyone would be brought up on charges before the Commission; it will be the opposite. We do not want to be known as the “preservation police”. We want residents to have the opportunity to be informed of the violation, to know there is a process and communicative staff available to help resolve it, and if necessary, the residents can come before the Commission. At some point, staff will begin to schedule violation Commission meetings (such as the 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesday of the month) and would methodically address all existing violations found by staff survey, including active violations. The final step in the program will be with referrals to BSEED/Property Maintenance, depending on the violation.

The violation meeting would be grouped by project, i.e., vinyl windows, demolished garages, etc. They will also be categorized by seriousness, age, etc., and treated in batches by district so the individual district’s Elements of Design can be considered. Everyone is treated equitably; any ruling at that meeting for a project would be consistent across all districts. One city council district would be addressed at a time, making sure to get the Council member and the DON on board as they may get calls.

Commissioner Franklin supported this approach. What about violations staff is already aware of?

Mr. Landsberg said yes, current violations will be involved in this approach. HDC staff is also working through the Property Maintenance and Construction divisions of BSEED, as they have different ways of handling violations.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Miriani motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:12 p.m.

Commissioner McCall – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5      Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**MEETING ADJOURNED**