

DETROIT HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

Date: June 9, 2021

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

[Actual Time] / Audio Recording Time Stamp

AGENDA

[05:37 pm] 00:36:29

I CALL TO ORDER

Chair Commissioner Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:37 p.m.

[05:38 pm] 00:38:00

II ROLL CALL

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION		PRESENT	ABSENT
Katie Johnson, Detroit	Chair	X	
Tiffany Franklin, Detroit	Vice-Chair	X	
Jim Hamilton, Detroit	Commissioner	X	
Richard Hosey, Detroit	Commissioner	X	
Alease Johnson, Detroit	Commissioner	X	
Dennis Miriani	Commissioner		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	

[05:40 pm] 00:40:00

III APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Commissioner Franklin moved to approve time limits on presentations by applicants:

- Limit applicant presentations to 20 mins
- Limit old presentation to 10 mins.
- Limit public comment to 2 mins.

Commissioner J. Hamilton - SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

Commissioner J. Hamilton moved to approve the Agenda with the following change:

- #21-7215 240 Mack application added to the agenda.

Commissioner A. Johnson - SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[05:43 pm]
00:43:00

IV APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner J. Hamilton made a motion to APPROVE the March 10, 2021 Regular Meeting minutes.

Commissioner Hosey– SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[05:44 pm]
00:44:00

V REPORTS

Director Landsberg reported on following:

- Administrative Approvals Report, for the previous month
- Violations & Enforcement Report, for the previous month
- These reports are available on our public website
- 12226 Dexter- emergency demolition of commercial building, report by J. Ross, which was ordered and happened as response to a safety hazard.

[5:45 pm]
00:45:00

VI APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO CONSENT AGENDA

None

[5:45 pm]
00:45:00

VII POSTPONED APPLICATION

None

[5:45 pm]
00:45:00

VIII EFFECTS OF CITY OR CITY-ASSISTED PROJECTS (ADVISORY DETERMINATIONS)

None

[5:45 pm]
00:45:00

IX APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** #21-7291

ADDRESS: 363 W. Grand Blvd

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Hubbard Farms HD

APPLICANT: Alyssa Taylor Wendt

OWNER: Alyssa Taylor Wendt

SCOPE OF WORK: Erect new garage; demolition of existing garage previously approved

PROPOSAL: The applicant provided a complete application for the proposed new construction of a 748 SF garage and the demolition of the existing, 748 SF garage, previously approved. The scope of this proposal includes the following:

- Construct a 22' x 34' garage with a 42" deep concrete trench footing foundation, 4" concrete slab set back five feet from the side (southeast) property line and no setback from the rear (southwest) property line.
- This proposed garage will have optional features for future use of windows on the northwest side (facing the house) and framing for a secondary, optional garage door on the southwest side center elevation of the garage.
- Features of the proposed garage include the following:
 - Shingles: Owens Corning Oak Ridge, asphalt, color= aged cedar.

- Garage Door: Precision Door, single door, short panel design, color = match house (green)
- Entrance Door: Therma-Tru Benchmark 36"x80" steel, 3-panel design, color = match house (green)
- Exterior Carpentry
 - Shake siding (roof gable only): wood to match existing house, color = match house
 - Board & Batten: 12" wood boards, 1"x2" wood battens, color = match house Fascia: 10" h wood to match existing garage, color = match house
 - Trim: 1" x 4" H wood to match existing garage, color = match house
- Windows: none
- Exterior lighting: none.
- No additional site work. See also attached documents provided by the applicant.

[5:52 pm] **PUBLIC COMMENT: START (AUDIO)**
00:52:00 No comments

END (AUDIO)

[5:52 pm] **COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:**
00:52:00

- Straight-forward application.

[5:53 pm] **ACTION**
00:53:00 Commissioner Franklin moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7291 for 363 W. Grand Blvd.**, 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.

Commissioner A Johnson– SUPPORT

Ayes –5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[5:54 pm] ● **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** #21-7292, #21-7293, #21-7294
00:54:00 **ADDRESS:** 2019 Dalzelle, 2075-2087 Vermont
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Corktown HD
APPLICANT: Nicole Rittenour/Push Design, LLC
OWNERS: Corktown Historic Developments, LLC
SCOPE OF WORK: Erection of six (6) attached townhomes at rear of existing parcels
PROPOSAL: Per the submitted drawings and narrative, the applicant is proposing to erect a new multi-family townhouse development with integrated garages, in a contemporary design, as such:

- The proposed 10,185 SF building has a footprint of approximately 3400 SF and extends from the Dalzelle elevation south along the alley behind all three historic houses. The new six (6) new 2-bedroom townhouses, which are intended to form a “residential court” in combination with the houses fronting Vermont, are three (3) stories (33’) in height to the parapet, with garage parking for one auto on the lower level.
- The design features brick masonry (Bowerston Blush Buff Smooth juxtaposed with vertical accent brick bands) and cementitious siding (smooth Hardi Artisan 6” lap siding with mitered corners). The building has a flat roof divided into roof decks for each unit, each featuring bar stock railings. Doors include solid wood swing entry doors with sidelights and aluminum garage doors. Windows are proposed to be Marvin fiberglass casement, sliding, and fixed windows.
- The current vacant lot at 2075 Vermont is proposed to be landscaped as a community space, with a fire pit, yard space, and garden beds.

[6:06pm]
01:06:00

PUBLIC COMMENT: START (AUDIO)

- Blake Almstead, President of Corktown Historic Society- Concern
 - Lack of community engagement, more is to come.
- Tanya Carwana - Support with Concerns
 - Not engaged at all and live next door along time.
 - Construction encroaches on property and activity cause damage of fence and alley. Timing.
 - 40 Years resident
- Giles Simmer - Concern
 - Boardmember of Corktown Historic Society, submitted letter
 - Concern for engagement and concern for density in neighborhood.
- Frank Callis - Concern
 - Agrees with Almstead, concern with massing, elevations and character of development is in conflict with Corktown

END (AUDIO)

[6:13pm]
01:13:00

[6:13pm]
01:13:00

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:

- What’s been previously approved by the HDC Staff? J Ross was the staff reporter in 2018, and HDC approved full rehab with windows, siding, etc.
- The two smaller houses are single family with option to sell in the future.
- Was it a duplex? At least 3 units with unpermitted work was found evident.
- Past concern regarding the height. Existing buildings are taller than are nearby.
- Comm’r. Franklin concern for further community engagement so that more information can be involved in this development. Developer has confirmed only 1 community meeting so far. 8 people attended this meeting.
- Comm’r. Franklin expressed need to have notifications served to local community organizations beyond door-to-door canvassing.
- Commissioners received clarification on colors and graphics of the presentation. Color may be too bright.
- Commissioner A. Johnson states that the overall design meets the standards. But stated need for more community engagement and perhaps a need for porches.
- Commissioner Hamilton states that this development is not in conflict with homes. Large buildings nearby; not located amongst Corktown cottage

neighborhood. This context allows it to be okay. Top floor is a deck (3rd floor), which creates a potential conflict with height standards.

- Comm’r K. Johnson expressed concerns with massing on the alley, next to historic homes. Roof deck is not a visual impact, but the whole 3rd floor creates a larger massing. Does not have concerns around color.
- Comm’r. Franklin agrees with Comm’r K. Johnson that the development appears to be consuming rather than providing a backdrop. The color compatibility is also a concern.
- Colors are muted, as confirmed by the developer.
- Cmm’r. Hamilton raised parking as a concern for spill-over, but this is a zoning issue, not a historic issue. This project hasn’t yet been approved by zoning changes yet. The public can engage with zoning approval at that time.
- Cmm’r. Hamilton states that context matters in all these things. Any one project will be evaluated on its case and not necessarily set a precedent for anywhere else.
- Director Landsberg pointed to historic precedent of backyard developments that was previously documented that substantiated this proposal. Alley development and corner proximity were a factor to Staff’s recommendation.

[06:29 pm]
01:29:00

ACTION

Commissioner A. Johnson moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7292, 21-7293 and 21-7294 for 2019 Dalzelle, 2075 – 2087 Vermont**, 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.

Commissioner Hosey– SUPPORT

Ayes – 4 Nay – 1 (K. Johnson)

MOTION CARRIED

[06:33 pm]
01:33:00

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBERS:** #21-7295, 21-7296, 21-7297, 21-7298, 21-7299

ADDRESS: 1628-1650 Bagley

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Corktown HD

APPLICANT: Nikki Rittenour (Architect)

SCOPE OF WORK: Erection of four (4) multi-family buildings

PROPOSAL:

With the current submission, the applicant is seeking the Commission’s approval to erect a new multi-family residential development to include two (2) , three-story buildings (eight units each) and two (2), two-story carriage houses (3 units each). Each of the carriage houses includes seven interior/integrated parking spaces at the first story. See the submitted renderings, which provide details around the proposed new development.

[06:48 pm]
01:48:00

PUBLIC COMMENT: START (AUDIO)

- **Blake Almstead** – Corktown Historic Society - Concerned
 - One of the cottages has a setback that matches the townhouses, but CHS believes it will diminish existing historic structures.

- One of the existing cottages that has had 140 years view of Bagley will be lost due to the wall of the proposed building.
- Community engagement is not being address. We have no record that Clement Kerns, which is directly across the street, has been contacted at all.
- Letters of support that are posted on line are disingenuous and appear to have content that was copy-pasted.
- They are happy to facilitate community meetings.
- Lack of genuine community feedback is concerning.
- **Frank Callis - Concerned**
 - Lives 4 houses away from the development on Bagley. The postcard he received was the first time he heard about this development.
 - Vacant lot used to have a house that matched existing house.
 - The frame does not create voids behind it like the existing apartment does. The front wall is not at the sidewalk, but they're setback from the sidewalk.
 - Carriage houses were not more than 2 stories high. By 1950s these were gone.
 - Klemmit Kearns going to be torn down. That shouldn't be a concern for matching them.
- **Giles Simmer – Concerned**
 - This project has had no communication with the community.
 - What can be changed so that developers are required to speak to the community before having this kind of meeting where folks are stating that they've never seen this.
 - Carriage houses in Corktown- she states that folks could not afford to have carriage behind anything.
 - Concerned about a large, beautiful tree will be chopped down, not being addressed in developer images. Wants a commitment from the developer to not take this tree down.
- **Drake Filippis – Supports**
 - Owner and resident in Corktown area.
 - They like the density of this project, which is good for the community and local businesses.
 - Likes the progressive and forward thinking in the design, which will help Corktown grow and wants to see this development built as soon as possible.

END (AUDIO)

[06:59 pm]

01:59:00

[07:00 pm]

02:00:00

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:

- Comm'r Hamilton asked how developer utilized Corktown's Elements of Design. Developer states that they took cues from adjacent townhouse design.
- Comm'r Franklin asked for reasoning on west-side setback. Developer states that design reviews were done, and all setbacks are in line with zoning code except the rear setback, which the developer will go for a zoning variance. This is where zoning requires less than an 8-foot setback and they are proposing an 8-foot setback. Staff clarified that the detached buildings to the west have a deeper setback to the buildings to the front. Developer has a porch roof that does out 4-5 feet from the adjacent house.

- Director Landsberg responded to community engagement concerns and stated that as member of Planning and Development Department, he can stipulate that the PDD fully supports efforts for developers to complete community engagement on all projects. There’s a Community Benefits Ordinance that requires community engagement that kicks in at certain scale and cost, but that does not include smaller projects, like this one, as per City Council. Under State enabling legislation and the local ordinance for historic districts, the only “community engagement” requirement would be a public hearing mail out, which was completed for this project.
- Comm’r Franklin raised concern for glass balcony rails. Developer is willing to listen potential to change railing design.
- Developer committed to keep tree that was raised as a concern for removal by the community. Comm’r Franklin reminded developer that removal of any landscaping should be pre-approved by HDC Staff.
- Comm’r Hamilton commented on how new buildings need to blend in, not stand out and the proposal’s density.
 - There are town houses adjacent and to the rear.
 - The line of the setback should be the houses not the building on the corner.
 - Buildings are too tall, 3 full stories that are not on the corner.
 - Klement Kearns Gardens will be demolished is an influence to the developer’s design.
 - Across the street will be a large development.
 - Porches/balconies are large in scale, with the white arch. Design does not match the historic context.
 - Color choices to be toned down.
 - Staff concerns raised as conditions. Developer open to these changes.

[07:16 pm]
02:14:18

ACTION

Commissioner Hosey moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7295 - 7299 for 1628 – 1650 Bagley**, 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 select a balcony railing product that more closely replicates existing railings within the district. The applicant shall present the new railing product to HDC staff for review and approval prior to the submission of the final CDs/application to the building’s department/prior to permitting.
- The siding proposed for the townhomes shall have a horizontal expression. The siding may be masonry, wood, composite, or cementitious. However, it cannot be a James Hardi product. The applicant shall present the new siding proposal to HDC staff for review and approval prior to the submission of the final CDs/application to the building’s department/prior to permitting.

- The applicant shall select a color palette for the townhomes that more closely aligns with the districts Elements of Design. The applicant shall present the new color palate to HDC staff for review and approval prior to the submission of the final CDs/application to the building’s department/prior to permitting.
- Any new wood fencing shall be stained or painted a color which is compatible with the approved color palette for the buildings within one calendar year of the issuance of the project’s permit. The applicant shall present the new color choice to HDC staff for review and approval prior to the submission of the final CDs/application to the building’s department/prior to permitting.

Commissioner K. Johnson – SUPPORT

Ayes – 3 Nay – 2 (T. Franklin, J. Hamilton)

MOTION CARRIED

[07:19 pm]
02:18:25

• **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** #21-7301

ADDRESS: 1427 Seyburn

HISTORIC DISTRICT: West Village HD

APPLICANT: Ashley Davidson

OWNERS: Ashley Davidson and Carlo Liburdi

SCOPE OF WORK: Erection of new garage, modification of previously approved design

PROPOSAL:

The 2018 application included a proposal to erect a garage within the property’s rear yard:

At the rear yard, erect a new 2-car garage as per the attached plans and elevations. The exterior walls will be clad with vinyl siding with & faux vinyl shake in the gable ends. The color of the vinyl will match the house. The gable ends at the east and west elevation each includes a 1/1 vinyl window. The east elevation also includes a single person door while the west elevation includes two overheard garage doors. The building shall display a 27’x22’ footprint and a 20’ height. The garage will sit 42’-5 1/2” back from the house. The garage will include a full story on the ground floor with a ½ -story, loft space.

Staff recommended that the Commission approve the application as proposed. The Commission approved the project, to include the erection of the garage as per the submitted drawings.

With the current application, the property owners are seeking the Commission’s approval to revise the garage design. Please see the submitted drawings and narrative. The new garage will be similar to the design which was approved in 2018 in that it proposes vinyl siding, vinyl windows, and a 29’-1/2” x 23’ footprint. Specific differences between former/design approved by the Commission in 2018 and the new design include the following:

- The height is lowered from 1.5 stories to one story
- The double doors on the rear/alley-facing elevation were replaced with a single 18’-0”-wide door
- A French door and two vinyl awning windows were added to the east elevation
- A wood pergola and outdoor sink is proposed at the east elevation
- Skylights are proposed at the roof

[07:26pm]
02:24:25

PUBLIC COMMENT: START (AUDIO)

- None

[07:27pm]
02:25:25

END (AUDIO)

[07:27pm]
02:25:25

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:

- Commissioners discussed how the previous approved materials from HDC 3 years ago, bank loan is based on previously approved aluminum, and now that this affects the applicant.
- Commissioners point out that this is new construction, not a renovation of historic material and not a visible location.
- Kudos to the HDC Staff for their consistency.

[07:29pm]
02:28:25

ACTION

Commissioner T. Franklin moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7301 for 1427 Seyburn**, 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.

Commissioner Hamilton – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[07:30pm]
02:30:25

• **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #21-7307**

ADDRESS: 858 Edison

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Boston-Edison HD

APPLICANT: Charles McCrary, Designer

OWNERS: Isatou and Carlisle Whitfield

SCOPE OF WORK: New proposal to revise previously approved addition, per work completed

PROPOSAL:

The applicant, in response to BSEED enforcement activity requested by HDC staff, is seeking approval of the as-built alterations to the design previously approved by the Commission, as described in the attached drawings and the staff observations.

[07:50 pm]
02:55:16

PUBLIC COMMENT: START (AUDIO)

- Ayesha Albert: Supports project
 - States that there is no explanation that you have to have permission for construction when you buy a home in a HD.
 - Intolerance of HDC, no clarity from both parties
 - Neighbors don't have problem with this project.
 - Welcome investment in this project
- Melanie Markowicz: Does not support project
 - 3rd time this design has come before the HDC

- Approving this current development would essentially approve what was previously denied.
- Lorenzo Gary: Supports project
 - Next door resident and has no problem with it.
 - This family is a young couple trying to do their best. Why are you so hard on these guys?
 - Wants to redo his back porch.
 - Grandparents bought his house in 1965.
- Pierre Haden: Not for or against the project
 - Calling from Jamaica, VP of Historic Boston Edison Assoc.
 - Wants to help mediate this discussion

END (AUDIO)

[08:07 pm]

03:07:10

[08:07 pm]

02:30:25

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:

- Applicants consist of 4 individuals: design team and owner.
- Applicant raises concerns on staff report’s accuracy. Staff asserts that these were addressed properly and as stated in the applicant’s drawing set and that the design professional did not coordinate the elevation with the plans.
- Applicant discusses history of the area and the project.
- Discussion on the process and steps that were carried out on this project. Applicant agrees that this application is to request new approval for new direction of the plans, not what was previously approved, particularly the roof.
- Staff points out that the elevation, not just the roof has deviated.
- Staff points out that elevation drawings were done that captured what was previously approved by the HDC.
- Commissioners state that the elevation drawings, not the floor plans, are what is under review.
- Commissioners state that the windows that were approved are now gone, and should be corrected.
- Commissioners state that new drawings need to be done.
- Commissioners raised concerns regarding the massing on the 3rd floor, there is no longer a dormer which has changed the whole design of what was approved, as well as the windows.
- Commissioners requesting applicant to come back with a revised drawings that addresses the roof design, 3rd floor massing, dormer that is similar in scale to the original dormer, and the windows replaced.
- Dormer that is similar in scale to the original dormer.

[08:23 pm]

03:23:50

ACTION

Commissioner Hosey moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7307 for 858 Edison**, 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 as-built revision to the previously approved addition IS NOT APPROPRIATE according

to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore DENIES a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS for the proposed work.

The Commission's reasons 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 historic property shall be preserved.*
- (6) *Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
- (9) *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
- (10) *New additions and adjacent or related new construction, shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

Commissioner J. Hamilton – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[08:25 pm]
03:25:18

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** Not available

ADDRESS: 200 Edmund Place

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Brush Park HD

APPLICANT: Andrew Bodley (Architect)/Bedrock (Owner)

OWNERS: Brush Park Development Company Phase 1 LLC

SCOPE OF WORK: Revision of previously approved multi-family building design

PROPOSAL:

The applicant appeared in front of this body at the February 17, 2016 special meeting with a proposal to establish a new mixed-use, multiple-building development (to include commercial and multiple family) within the area bounded by John R, Brush Street, Alfred, and Edmund Place. The development included several building typologies to include apartments, duplexes, townhomes, and carriage homes. The Commission issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal as presented. With the current proposal, the applicant is seeking to

revise the previously-approved “Apartment Building A-1” design located at 200 Edmund Place (see the applicant’s submission for the building design which was approved in 2016). Specifically, the design the Commission approved in 2016 was to be erected according to the following:

- At the highest/northernmost mass, the building was to rise 6 stories and measure 77’-0” in height. As the building extends southward, it would gradually step down to 3 stories, measuring 42’-0” in height
- Exterior walls were to be grey brick with prominent sweeps of projecting brick detailing proposed at the front elevation in order to provide texture
- Windows were proposed as 1/1 double-hung and fixed aluminum units, in deeply recessed openings and with several windows turning corners
- Mesh guardrails were proposed at the rooftop terraces

The current design revisions include the following:

- At its highest mass, the building will rise to 5 stories and measure 67’-0” in height. The building would gradually step down to 3 stories, measuring 42’-0” in height
- The exterior walls will be clad with grey brick. The projecting brick detailing will be replaced with variegated grey brick cladding.
- Windows are combo awning and fixed aluminum units to be trimmed with metal cladding. Wraparound windows at corners have been deleted.
- Metal picket railing will be added at the terraces

It is noted the building has been erected and the windows installed. Also, brick cladding has been added to the south and east elevations. Currently, the work has been suspended until the June 9, 2021 HDC meeting so that this body can review the proposed/undertaken revisions.

[08:50 pm]

03:50:54

PUBLIC COMMENT: START (AUDIO)

- None

END (AUDIO)

[08:50 pm]

03:50:11

[08:51 pm]

03:51:34

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:

- Commissioners agree that the removal of textured brick makes the material too flat.
- Commissioners discuss how the parapet height changes the overall look of the building. Discussion on the masses and the parapets.
- Commissioners stated that the windows may be a problem. However, the original design had double hung windows, the current version shows more complexity, which is desirable, and may be a solution to the problem.
- Commissioners state that variation of color and texture should be considered.

[09:06 pm]

04:05:50

ACTION

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **the submitted application for 200 Edmund Place**, 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:

- Re-incorporate substantial brick texturing or other articulation, acceptable to staff and per Commission guidance, to introduce the texture and complexity expected by the District’s Elements of Design, specifically Elements 8, 10, 19, and 22.
- Give additional prominence to the Edmund Place façade to match the prominence of the John R facade, acceptable to staff and per Commission guidance, per Elements 21 and 22

Commissioner A. Johnson – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[09:08 pm]
04:08:18

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #21-7308**

ADDRESS: 240 Mack

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Brush Park HD

APPLICANT: James Korf, Composition Workshop

OWNERS: EMO Properties, LLC

SCOPE OF WORK: Revision of previously approved multi-family building design

PROPOSAL:

Per the submitted drawings, the applicant is proposing to rehabilitate the building and add a third story to the rear non-historic section, to return the building to service as apartments.

[09:15 pm]
04:15:18

PUBLIC COMMENT: START (AUDIO)

- None

[09:15 pm]
04:15:18

END (AUDIO)

[09:15 pm]
04:15:18

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:

- Work was done by a previous owner
- Applicant confirmed that the rear windows are aluminum-clad wood windows, not simulated divided lights, and include slider windows.
- Applicant confirmed that the west elevation lap siding will be removed.
- Windows were added without approval. JR worked with Mr. Foster back in 2017 and raised the question if these windows are appropriate. HDC denied this work back then, which means violation still stands on this property.

[09:25 pm]
04:24:18

ACTION

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7308 for 240 Mack**, 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:

- No windows at the property will be vinyl. Windows for the non-historic rear block will be of a type, configuration and material that complements the historic context, approvable by staff.
- The scale of the roof addition will be reduced. The height of the proposed roof addition will be less than or equal to the height of the historic roof. Such revision in scale and height will be subject to staff approval.

Commissioner Hosey – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

X CITY PROJECTS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

[09:26 pm]
04:26:50

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** #21-7300
ADDRESS: 2200 (2600) Atwater
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Aretha Franklin Amphitheater / Chene Park HD
APPLICANT: Carla Pareja, Hamilton Anderson Associates, Lee Carter
OWNERS: City Of Detroit
SCOPE OF WORK: Erection of new building to include restrooms and ADA seating
PROPOSAL:
The scope of work within this application focuses on the construction of a new building that will house toilet facilities with usable rooftop space, a lift/elevator, and accessible seating area. Lighting and new planting material as part of, and adjacent to, the structure is also proposed.

[09:39 pm]
04:39:54

PUBLIC COMMENT: START (AUDIO)

- None

END (AUDIO)

[09:39 pm]
04:39:11

[09:40 pm]
04:39:34

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:

- Commissioners state that this is a very good presentation, good use of materials, good rhythm and feel.
- Discussion on tree plantings, adjacent to the building, outfall obstruction and view obstruction.
- Signage discussion, have a holistic approach and use of uniformity.

[09:47 pm]
04:46:50

ACTION

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7300 for 2200 Atwater**, 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 drawings will note which panel will be used for the privacy walls on the roof.

- An additional tree plan will be submitted showing where new evergreen plantings will be placed.
- Details on the storage enclosure (lighting and door) will be submitted to staff for review and approval.
- Signage will be submitted to staff for review and approval.
- Staff has authority to review and approve the future-phase accessible seating, based on the preliminary design.

Commissioner Franklin – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[09:49 pm]
04:49:50

XI PUBLIC COMMENT

- Bill Sneed: Applicant, waiting for their turn to present.

IX APPLICATIONS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

[09:50 pm]
04:50:34

Commissioner Tiffany Franklin recuses herself from the following case

[09:50 pm]
04:50:34

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #21-7245**

ADDRESS: 19505 Canterbury

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Sherwood Forest HD

APPLICANT: Brittany and Jamie Snell

PROPERTY OWNER: Brittany and Jamie Snell

SCOPE OF WORK: Install front yard walkway and steps (tabled from May 2021 meeting)

PROPSAL:

The current owner provided an application, project narrative, site photos, and construction layout for the following proposed work: construct a four-foot wide paver walkway from the front entrance to the public sidewalk and from the driveway to the proposed paver walkway (400 SF) with multiple single steps as shown in attached drawings. No lighting will be included in the walkway. Pavers will be made from Unilock Classic Brussels Block pavers in sandstone color with distressed, timeworn finish. Copthorne 3-color blend will form the accent border of the walkway to resemble the brick of the house.

[09:50 pm]
04:50:34

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:

- Applicant discusses delays due to supply and durability of products.
- Applicant stated that the house bricks are clinker brick, and new brick would detract from the house.
- Limestone colored pavers were chosen by the applicant.

[10:04 pm]
05:04:20

ACTION

Commissioner A. Johnson move that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7245 for 19505 Canterbury**, 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 work with Staff to issue a more appropriate material than the composite concrete block for the pavers.
- Applicant work with Staff to adjust the design of the walkway with the following changes: Consolidate steps to a single or dual occurrence.

Commissioner Hosey – SUPPORT

Ayes – 4 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[10:05 pm] **Commissioner Tiffany Franklin rejoins the meeting.**

05:04:34

[10:05 pm] • **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #21-7218**

05:04:56

ADDRESS: 14838 Rosemont

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Rosedale Park HD

APPLICANT: Trajan Centers (male)

PROPERTY OWNER: Trajan Centers (male)

SCOPE OF WORK: Install wooden arched arbor at front walkway, landscaping (tabled from May 2021 meeting)

PROPOSAL:

The current owner provided an application, project narrative, site photos, and construction detail for the following proposed work: construct a wooden arbor (4'x2'x7') over the front entrance walkway that leads from the public sidewalk to the front door. No footings will be installed with the arbor; each post will be buried 12" in the ground. The arbor is proposed to be painted white to match the front awning of the house. Landscape installation is to plant 2 trees: one magnolia and one cherry tree in the front yard on either side of the entrance walkway.

[10:05 pm]

05:05:56

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:

- Applicant shows photos context photos. Staff also shows immediate neighbor photos to illustrate context of the neighborhood.
- Commissioners discuss how the arch is not indicative to this neighborhood. and how this introduces a new element to this neighborhood.

[10:13 pm]

05:13:50

ACTION ONE

Commissioner Franklin moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7218 for 14838 Rosemont**, 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 that introduction of a white-painted or a wood arbor 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 reasons for denial is that the proposed work fails to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, specifically Standards:

(1) A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the

defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

(5) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

(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 Hamilton – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[10:13 pm]
05:12:50

ACTION TWO

Commissioner Franklin moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7218 for 14838 Rosemont**, 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 planting of two trees 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 Hamilton – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[10:16 pm]
05:16:24

• **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #21-7309**

ADDRESS: 1716 Chicago

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Boston-Edison HD

APPLICANT: Jordan Contreras (Pro Home Improvement)

PROPERTY OWNER: Mazoul Beasley

SCOPE OF WORK: Vinyl siding installed on multiple areas of home, install aluminum gutters without approval

PROPOSAL:

The owner is working through a contractor whose application includes a project description, site photos, and material description for work already complete without approval: vinyl siding installed on multiple areas of home, installed aluminum trim, gutters and downspouts. See also attached documents provided by the applicant. All siding and soffits listed in this scope of work are vinyl. All gutters, downspouts, and trim are aluminum. All material was painted almond color:

1. Cover stucco siding of bay window with double 4” vinyl siding, color almond.
 - a. Insulate bottom of bay with foam board
2. Replace 8” aluminum siding with double 4” vinyl siding (Premium Quest), color almond. Locations include the following:
 - a. Dormers (front and rear)
 - b. Rear shed dormer
3. Replace wood trim for 41 windows and 3 doors with aluminum trim, color almond.
4. Replace roof soffit, with 3 1/3” vinyl soffits (Ventura), color almond at following locations:
 - a. Side elevation gables
 - b. Rear and front roof
5. Replace all gutters and downspouts at front and rear elevation roof with aluminum gutters and downspouts, color almond.

[10:18 pm]

05:18:34

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:

- Applicant states that a mistake was made and notes that there is a communication issue between BSEED’s Accela and HDC.
- Applicant confirmed that aluminum siding was removed and was replaced with vinyl. Staff confirmed that the age of the house would predate aluminum siding altogether and was likely wood originally.
- Work was done before a permit was issued.
- Applicant confirmed that the windows are aluminum clad.
- Staff confirmed that the original material would be wood or stucco.
- Vinyl is on all dormers, the backside, soffits and stucco.
- Aluminum siding was likely up for 40 years according to the applicant.

[10:37 pm]

05:36:39

ACTION ONE

Commissioner Franklin moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7309 for 1716 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 that the replacement of stucco and aluminum siding with vinyl siding and the replacement of wood trim and wood soffits with aluminum and vinyl material on the house 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 reasons 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 historic property shall be preserved.*

- (6) *Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
- (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

[10:39 pm]
05:38:37

ACTION TWO

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7309 for 1716 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 for new gutters and downspouts 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 either redirect the front entrance downspouts to their original configuration or provide a paint color to HDC staff that matches the brick color to retain the current locations of the downspouts.

Commissioner A. Johnson – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[10:43 pm]
05:43:05

• **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #21-7310**

ADDRESS: 19355 Parkside

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Sherwood Forest HD

APPLICANT: Renee Paskell Carry Paskell, Brian Rozanski

PROPERTY OWNER: Renee Paskell

SCOPE OF WORK: Window Replacement

PROPOSAL:

The application before the Commission is to replace a steel sash window on the east elevation with two mulled awning windows, and to replace the eight fixed glass wood windows in the front elevation bow window.

Living Room – Steel Window – East Elevation

Existing opening contains a double casement window with transoms. The horizontal transoms of the original windows will not be replicated in the Pella windows. A

change order was submitted to have a muntin bar placed where the mullion is currently located. Therefore, the overall window pattern will remain, but the dimensionality will be reduced.

[10:45 pm]
05:45:34

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:

- Applicant described details of the proposed windows.
- Discussion on simulated mutton/divided glass windows.
- Discussion on experimental windows and their locations.
- Discussion on repairable condition of the windows.
- Discussion on finding contractors willing to do the work.
- Motion discussion on notice to proceed and the Standards.
- Commissioner sees this as an experiment, not a precedent necessarily.
- Commissioners and staff state that these motions will be based on a technical and feasibility standard.

[11:13 pm]
06:13:08

ACTION

Commissioner K. Johnson moved:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7310 for 19355 Parkside** 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.

Commissioner Hosey– SUPPORT

Ayes – 4 Nay – 0 Abstain – 1 (Tiffany Franklin)

MOTION CARRIED

[11:18 pm]
06:18:08

• **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #21-7284**

ADDRESS: 1509 Broadway

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Broadway Avenue HD

APPLICANT: Michael Richards

PROPERTY OWNER: Ari Heckman

SCOPE OF WORK: Installation of Super Signage

PROPOSAL: Vinyl mesh 110'x56 sign, on east facade

[11:23 pm]
06:23:08

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:

- Issue for Staff is that the adjacent lot is a Detroit People Mover location.
- Staff recommends a denial.
- Vinyl mesh to cover the windows was in the original design, but moved to the hard surface.
- Sign is 110 feet by 30 feet. Shortened to 90 feet is ok by applicant.
- Applicant confirms it is a static sign that changes 2-3 times per year.
- 45 signs can be approved by BSEED in this area.

[11:30 pm]
06:30:08

ACTION

Commissioner Hamilton moved:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7284 for 1509 Broadway**, 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 top edge of the sign will align with the second-floor level below the second window.

Commissioner Franklin– SUPPORT

Ayes – 3 Nay – 2 (A. Johnson, K. Johnson)

MOTION CARRIED

[11:34 pm]
06:34:08

• **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #21-7311**

ADDRESS: 3934 W. Lafayette

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Hubbard Farms HD

APPLICANT: Daniel Lopez

PROPERTY OWNER: Thomas Galea

SCOPE OF WORK: Replaced front porch without approval

PROPOSAL: The applicant provided an application, project narrative, and site photos for the following work completed 3 years ago: demolition of existing ramp, construct a new front porch roof, repair and replace front porch decking, and construct new staircase with new railing.

[11:36 pm]
06:36:08

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:

- Discussion on what are original materials and which are considered character defining features.
- Discussion on the balance of the building is off by the new roof gable and hides the first floor windows, changing the character and balance of the house.
- Commissioners agree that most of the porch is ok, but something has to be done about the gable.

[11:47 pm]
Second
recording
00:01:02

ACTION ONE

Commissioner Hamilton moved:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7311 for 3934 W. Lafayette**, 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 that the removal of the historic metal railing and addition of the new porch roof, and posts. ARE NOT 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 reasons 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.*
10. *New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

Commissioner A. Johnson– SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[11:48 pm]

Second
recording
00:02:08

ACTION TWO

Commissioner Hamilton moved:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7311 for 3934 W. Lafayette**, 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 removal of the ramp, repair of existing decking, and construction of new stairs and installation of new railings IS 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 T. Franklin– SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[11:50 pm]
Second
recording
00:04:38

• **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #21-7312**

ADDRESS: 3000 Seminole

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Indian Village HD

APPLICANT: William Sneed

PROPERTY OWNER: William Sneed

SCOPE OF WORK: Replace garage door

PROPOSAL: The applicant is requesting to remove the existing wood garage doors and to install automatic steel doors. The two single door openings and brick support pier between the openings will remain.

[11:53 pm]
Second
recording
00:05:17

COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS:

- Discussion on repair conditions of the doors.
- Discussion on size, weight and character of the doors.
- Discussion on if they character defining doors.
- Discussion on skill trades for repair of doors.
- Discussion on cost of garage doors.
- Discussion on recommendation of contractors and City policy.

[12:16 am]
Second
recording
00:30:17

ACTION

Commissioner Hosey moved:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7312 for 3000 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 that the replacement of wood garage doors with steel doors **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 reasons for denial is that the proposed work fails to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, specifically Standards:

- 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 Franklin– SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

MOTION CARRIED

[12:17 am]
Second
recording
00:31:17

XIII CITY PROJECTS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

None

[12:17 am]
Second
recording
00:31:17

XIV OLD BUSINESS

None

[12:17 am]
Second
recording
00:31:17

XV NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Hosey moved to approve a waiver of the waiting period for the applicant at 200 Edmund place:

Commissioner Hamilton– SUPPORT

Ayes – 4 Nay – 0 Abstain – 1 (K. Johnson)

MOTION CARRIED

[12:20 am]
Second
recording
00:34:17

XVI ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner T. Franklin motioned to adjourn the meeting at June 10, 2021 12:20 am.

Commissioner Hamilton – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

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)
- Planning & Development Department (PDD)