

**DETROIT HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**

Date: October 13, 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**

[05:35 pm] 00:26:05 **I CALL TO ORDER**  
Chair Commissioner Katie Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

[05:36 pm] 00:26:59 **II ROLL CALL**

<b>HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION</b>		<b>PRESENT</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Katie Johnson, Detroit	Chair	X	
Tiffany Franklin, Detroit (portion of the meeting)	Vice-Chair	X	
Jim Hamilton, Detroit	Commissioner	X	
Richard Hosey, Detroit	Commissioner	X	
Alease Johnson, Detroit	Commissioner	X	
Brandon Lockhart, Nashville, TN	Commissioner	X	
Dennis Miriani, Detroit, MI	Commissioner	X	
<b>STAFF</b>			
Brendan Cagney	PDD	X	
Audra Dye	PDD	X	
Garrick Landsberg	PDD	X	
Ann Phillips	PDD	X	
Daniel Rieden	PDD	X	
Jennifer Ross	PDD	X	
Antoine Bryant	PDD	X	
Katy Trudeau	PDD	X	
Rebecca Savage	HDAB	X	

[05:38 pm] 00:28:20 **III APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**  
Director Landsberg has struck four cases that have been withdrawn and those cases have been struck from the agenda:

- 14901, 14917, 14927 E. Jefferson
- 4440 E. Canfield, Sweetest Heart of Mary
- 19957 Parkside
- 1502 Randolph St.

Commissioner J. Hamilton moved to have following case on the Consent Agenda:

- Add 108 E. Forest to the Consent Agenda

Commissioner A. Johnson - SUPPORT

Ayes – 6      Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

Commissioner J. Hamilton moved to approve the Agenda:

Commissioner Hosey - SUPPORT  
Ayes – 6      Nay – 0  
**MOTION CARRIED**

[05:41 pm]  
00:32:40

**IV APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Commissioner Hosey made a motion to APPROVE the following meeting minutes:

- September 8, 2021- Regular Meeting

Commissioner Miriani – SUPPORT  
Ayes – 5      Nay – 0      Abstain – 1 (Hamilton)  
**MOTION CARRIED**

[05:43 pm]  
00:33:30

**V REPORTS**

Director Landsberg reported on

- All reports including the applications, violations, staff reports, and minutes are posted on the HDC website.
- Ms. Rebecca Savage of the Historic District Advisory Board (HDAB) provided an update on the following:
  - HDAB is working to designate Krainz Woods as a new historic district
  - HDAB manages Certified Local Government grants; currently reviewing one for the Cass Corridor and one for Fort Wayne stabilization.
  - HDAB has 2 open grants through the National Park Service Underrepresented Communities Grant:
    - 8 Mile - Wyoming Study
    - LatinX Historic Context Study

[05:45 pm]  
00:36:28

**VI APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO CONSENT AGENDA**

Commissioner J. Hamilton moved to approve the Consent Agenda:

- 108 E. Forest to the Consent Agenda

Commissioner Hosey- SUPPORT

Ayes – 6      Nay – 0  
**MOTION CARRIED**

[05:47 pm]  
00:38:52

**VII POSTPONED APPLICATION**

None

[05:47 pm]  
00:38:52

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

None

[05:47 pm]  
00:38:52

**IX APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING**

None

**X CITY PROJECTS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING**

[05:47 pm]  
00:38:52

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** #21-7524 GL  
**ADDRESS:** 8029 Coe, 1500-1532 Van Dyke  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** West Village HD

**APPLICANT:** Brian Hurttienne (Contractor)

**OWNER:** Clifford Brown (Woodborn Partners)

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Erection of 4-story multi-family/town-home building development requiring demolition of two (2) houses

**PROPOSAL:** Per the submitted documents, The applicant proposes to demolish the existing garage and construct a 24 ft. x 30 ft., three-car garage with new concrete footing/floor slab.

[06:16 pm]  
01:06:28

**PUBLIC COMMENT: START (AUDIO)**

- Brent Snavely: West Village resident of 15 years welcomes the density of the development but concerned with parking capacity. The architecture doesn't fit with the character of the neighborhood.
- Mark Reynolds: West Village resident for 25 years, expressed concern for the existing houses and trees that are on the site. Would like to see an audit on the cost for the moves. States that if there is an NTP, there needs to be some written commitment from the developer that all these concerns will be addressed. Expressed that there are not enough mature trees and not very many 1800 houses left in this area. Compared work an average home owner has to achieve versus a developer to comply with the HDC.
- Melanie Markowicz of Preservation Detroit: Resident in West Village. Conceptually supports the development by offering more density and options for living in the neighborhood. Raised concern on the setback along VanDyke so that more in line with the neighborhood's lawn and trees. Coe Street does have more examples of building to the lot line, so this is less of a concern than the Van Dyke setback. BZA hasn't seen this variance yet, so what we see today doesn't appear to be legal. Like to see more trees on Van Dyke, break up the massing of the building into smaller components, and think about the materiality more. Believes this deal was made with the understanding that these 2 contributing historic buildings would be saved and moved. Feels like presenting this work with these concerns not yet worked out before the HDC seems premature for the HDC to make a decision.
- Josh Dorn resident of West Village for 11-12 years and member of the West Village Association: The letter of support that was referenced was based on the condition that setbacks raised earlier be addressed. Would like to see the setback on Van Dyke increased to be more in character with the neighborhood. The talk about density versus parking and the commercial viability of getting enough units to make the development viable was discussed by the developer to potentially raise the building above four stories to meet these goals and the setback. Would like to see other options to address parking.
- Akunna Olumba resident since 2003 and grew up in this neighborhood since 8 years old: Supports development in general. We live in the row house and likely most affected by this development. The four stories would kill all of our sunlight coming from the east. Traffic congestion and unavailable parking is a concern. Traffic congestion on Van Dyke, there's frequent accidents on the street. Design of the building- the character of the materials of the neighborhood with red brick and wood- is not matched and the exterior could look more like the buildings that are present. Prefer to see the town houses on VanDyke and the multi-family on Coe.
- Sean Everett resident of the Coe 1: Asks what the end goal of moving the two homes and what would be the affordability for individuals to actually purchase and maintain them in the long term. Believes that the cost would be out of reach for many people to live there. Believes that the area would benefit from the increased density

and lighting. His car was stolen and vandalized. Agrees with the setback and the greenspace being considered.

- Kristin Keen resident of West Village and member of West Village Association Board: References the support letter that was sent. Requests clarification from the developer regarding the need for approval to make changes to the plan, especially since changes are listed as condition for support. Has concern that approval would allow developer to toss out those conditions later. Like to see the building scaled down to address the setback, landscape, tree preservation and parking to blend into the neighborhood and address everyone's concerns.
- Hannah Mills, resident and home owner of WV: Need to address the Van Dyke setback, setback from the northside where a duplex has been rehabbed, and an assessment of the mature trees. We are losing trees in our neighborhood and they're essential to our property values. Agrees with previous comment to scale down approach.
- Timothy Boscarino, Detroit resident: Wants to keep the elm tree, states that it is an American Elm and a character defining feature for Detroit.
- Penn Greene lives in West Village for past 6 years. Opposed to tearing down the two old houses and have friends interested in buying these houses but not able to purchase them. Feels it is sad that these old houses could be taken care of and kept. Would like to see those old houses last, buy them, take care of them and learn from them.
- Robert Graham: States that he is a developer and rehabber in Detroit and is opposed to tearing down these historic properties. Believes that adding to the land with new development without tearing down the house is an option. Tearing down these houses is a travesty.
- Marsden Burger: (audio/technical difficulties- no comments made until later- see below).
- John Sarns: After hearing comments on saving the houses, felt need to make a comment. The house on 1532 VanDyke has been vacant and looking sad for over 15 years, and to hear folks say that it's a candidate for rehab, I don't think they're being realistic. I looked at it today, and it's past the point of saving in my opinion.
- Nate Barnes: He wanted to provide context on what it takes to move a home, especially in West Village. He was part of a team that moved a greenhouse from the Kercheval/VanDyke site. It took a lot of time and money that was almost cost prohibitive. It takes a lot to move it without falling apart and to determine where it would be located.
- Marsden Burger, resident of West Village for over 30 years: Thanked Cliff Brown for his meeting with the residents and stated that Mr. Brown took on the responsibility for poor community outreach. Went through this process before with Coe I. Personally feels that the building is oppressive. Parking looks like its going through the alley onto Coe and St. Paul, which is a very tight street. Concerned with parking, traffic, plowing and bus traffic.

END (AUDIO)

[6:51 pm]  
01:42:28  
[05:56 pm]  
00:46:34

#### **COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS**

- Applicant /Owner – including Clifford Brown, Nathan Barnes, and Brian Hurtienne presented background on the project.
  - Working with PDD and community engagement.
  - Not wealthy developers.
  - Design takes cues from COE 1 for materiality and design.

- Landscape varies along the street.
- PDD Director, Antoine Bryant, and Deputy Director, Katy Trudeau- PDD supports the project's density and the basis of the project and supports the characterization of the Staff Report's concerns.
- Commissioners' discussion on setbacks with a request on whether these are based on legal/zoning or aesthetic concerns. The applicant stated that the setbacks are aesthetic whereas the zoning setbacks are severe and believe that they are not in relation to the neighborhood, and states that the PDD is suggesting setbacks on the north and VanDyke sides of the development. The applicant states that their design does not conform to the zoning regulations.
- HDC Staff clarified that this project is subject to a BZA hearing.
- Applicant stated they are willing to work with PDD to address concerns.
- Commissioners raised concerns on the scale/size of the massing on Van Dyke. This does not fit with the context of the rest of the block. Commissioners asked if there is more that can be done to break down the massing.
- Applicant states that they can address these concerns with the appropriate level of density that still honors the community. Podium structure allows parking under the development. Parking was a need requested by the community too.
- Commissioner raised concerns that the plans have received community and PDD responses, but the plan seen today doesn't yet address these concerns.
- The applicant wants to receive conditional approval to demonstrate to their investors that the HDC is in support of the project. The applicant brought letters of support from the West Village Association and other residents.
- Applicant responded to public comments and addressed record of maintenance on existing facilities:
  - Addressed moving the existing houses and the time/cost considerations that went into that effort, 1314 Van Dyke had multiple fires, sewage back up, and plumbing dug up all the way to the street. Squirrels have moved base boards. The houses were under study to move the building. Moving them would set back the project timeline. There is a current environment where costs continue to rise.
  - The other house has been available for years, the developer has offered his personal cell phone for the sale of these houses, but no one has contacted him.
  - Addressed landscape plans along VanDyke to have appropriate landscaping and trees along Van Dyke.
  - Addressed parking needs by adding parking to address community concerns.
  - Addressed community responsiveness and reached out to HRD, PDD, HDC regarding challenges of moving the homes. After many efforts we realized it can't be done cost effectively.
  - Addressed the darkness along Coe St. by providing more lighting.
  - Addressed the height of the building as being similar in height to the 4-story building across the street.
  - Acknowledged the need to address the setbacks, which was raised by PDD, but stated that they did not hear this concern from anyone else until this week. Will work with PDD to make these changes.
  - Like to get approval today with conditions to work with staff and understand that the project would not be able to move forward without these conditions met.

- Rebecca Savage, Staff of HDAB, stated: They agree with the Staff Report of the HDC, that these buildings are contributing buildings. In 1984 when this District's designation report was written, the staff did not choose contributing and non-contributing structures within a district. That's not what happened those days. Obviously today they would be contributing historic structures. HDAB agrees with the Staff Report as submitted.
- Commissioner raised concern around community engagement, and how recent this project was announced. Also raised concern about too much density at this location, wall along VanDyke, setbacks, scale and height. We don't have enough information to vote because there are too many unknowns.
- Commissioners discussed separating out the issues of demolition of the houses from the design of the new construction. HDC Staff reminded the Commission that this is under one application. Discussion on the similarities of this case to past cases where specific conditions had to be met. Commissioner discussed requirements under a Notice to Proceed and the justification for the demolition of historic buildings; therefore, the project must be sound to justify the demolition of the building. A condition could state that demolition is suspended until final approvals given.
- Commissioner Franklin concurs that there should not be any razing of buildings without any clear design resolutions.
- PDD Director Bryant stated that he met with the applicant and design team at length regarding many of the concerns raised tonight. We agree with both the HDC and the community is a needed development. PDD would not support razing of the buildings without a complete final design. Gave credit to the applicant for their responsiveness to these concerns.
- Commissioners discuss if anything in the application can be taken off the table.
- Commissioners requested clarification from the applicant if the setback recommendations would cause changes to the design of the proposal. The applicant stated that it would be similar but would need to consult the design team with regards to parking and landscaping.
- Commissioners requested that the applicant to look at the project boundaries to consider nearby adjacent lands to address issues such as parking. The applicant stated that they would look into that. Commissioners agree that the design and footprint of this project needs work.
- Commissioners raised other design issues such as:
  - VanDyke façade is too much and doesn't break up the property
  - 4<sup>th</sup> story setback.,
  - set too close to the adjacent house,
  - removing an American Elm,
  - setbacks along the VanDyke, introduces a new element of long street wall in this historic district
- Applicant requests HDC approval of the development that recognizes the benefits but adds a requirement to come back to this body for an approval of the design. This would allow the applicant to go back to his investment team to receive additional dollars for redesign.
- Commissioners raised concerns on "redesign". The applicant clarified this would be not a redesign but to address the concerns raised.
- Commissioners could modify the Staff Report recommendations to have the applicant come back to the Commission, not just PDD or HDC staff.
- Commissioners restate list of design concerns of the proposed design.

- PDD Director agrees with the HDC design recommendations. He would like to see more community engagement with the development team. He stated that tabling this application versus a Notice to Proceed might be perceived very differently from the development team and the development team may not see a way forward. He seeks to understand the ramifications of these two options. Commissioners added that they are being asked to make an advisory determination as well, so they could take a vote on that.
- Commissioners discussed approval at Commission level, not staff level, and seeks approval also from the PDD with stipulations that no demolition is done until final approval. The Commission would add front façade redesign too.
- HDC Staff reminded Commissioners that this proposal was subject to public hearing and following any motion to proceed the project would not require another public hearing. The Commissioners stated that they were comfortable with this.

[7:41 pm]  
02:32:00

### **ACTION ONE**

Commissioner Miriani moved that:

I move that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7524 for 8029 Coe and 1500–1532 Van Dyke** 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 NOT BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation. However, the Commission has determined that the following condition prevails and therefore ISSUES a NOTICE TO PROCEED for the proposed work because it is necessary to substantially improve or correct the following condition:

- (2) The resource is a deterrent to a major improvement program that will be of substantial benefit to the community. Substantial benefit shall be found only if the applicant proposing the work has obtained all necessary planning and zoning approvals, financing and environmental clearances, and the improvement program is otherwise feasible.

*The Notice to Proceed is issued with the following condition:*

- The NTP be suspended, and not issued, until the proposal is modified to incorporate recommendations of the Planning Department and additional recommendations that all changes to the design as presented in the application be approved by the Historic District Commission; satisfaction thereof to be confirmed to HDC staff, by the final approval of the Planning Director or his/her deputy and ultimately approved by the HDC.
- The NTP be suspended and not issued until the proposal satisfies all of the substantial benefits listed in (2) above.

Commissioner Hosey – SUPPORT

Ayes –7    Nay – 0    Abstain – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

### **ACTION TWO: Section 21-2-5, Effects of projects on districts**

Commissioner Miriani moved that:

I move that the Commission find that the proposed project at **8029 Coe, 1500-1532 Van Dyke** will have a demonstrable effect on the **West Village Historic District**, that such demonstrable effect is likely to be **beneficial**, due to the improvement of density in the neighborhood and repopulation of vacant lots, and that the determination of the Commission be reported to the Mayor and City Council for their consideration.

Commissioner A Johnson – SUPPORT  
Ayes –7                      Nay – 0    Abstain – 0  
**MOTION CARRIED**

[7:48 pm]  
02:38:50

**XI PUBLIC COMMENT**

- No comments.

[7:48 pm]  
02:38:50

**IX APPLICATIONS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING**

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #21-7512 AP**

**ADDRESS:** 1091 Seminole

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Indian Village HD

**APPLICANT:** Christian Unverzagt (Contractor)

**PROPERTY OWNER:** Kyle Smitley & Alex Rhea

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Demolish existing rear side porch and erect new rear side porch; modify existing rear addition

**PROPSAL:**

Per the submitted application, the applicant is seeking the Commission’s approval to demolish the existing rear side porch and erect a new rear side porch in same location as well as making exterior alterations to the existing rear addition.

[7:52 pm]  
02:38:50

**COMMISSION (AND DEVELOPER) COMMENTS**

- Applicant presents family and property background.
- Applicant’s architect presented case for porches and shared perspective for its application.
- Commissioners requested clarity on re-grading the rear yard, purpose of the rear windows being changed, and windows that were previously approved by the HDC Staff, and rear porch design details.
- Applicant states that they are restoring the connection between the living and dining areas access to both the porch and rear yard.
- Commissioners asked about the brick wall and the ability to restore this wall.
- Commissioner discussion on if this porch is a character defining feature.

[8:13 pm]  
03:03:29

**ACTION**

Commissioner Miriani moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7512 for 1091 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 proposed application: Demolish the existing rear side porch and erect a new rear side porch in same location and the exterior modifications to the existing addition at the north end of the house including the creation of a new masonry opening for door and transom as well as the erection of a small porch and stairs to access the rear yard **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 – 7 Nay – 0  
**MOTION CARRIED**

[08:15 pm]  
03:05:56

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** 21-7513 AP  
**ADDRESS:** 2310 Park (AKA Colony Club)  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Park Avenue HD  
**APPLICANT:** Terrance E. Ulch II, Aver Sign Co., Jennifer Glover  
**PROPERTY OWNER:** Jim Forbes, Forbes Reality  
**SCOPE OF WORK:** Install parapet signage at north façade  
**PROPOSAL:**

Per the submitted application, the applicant is seeking the Commission’s approval to install one (1) new parapet sign at the north elevation of the building. The proposed size of the sign is 34” H x 19’-4”. The sign is to be composed of individual channel letters which will be internally illuminated as well as halo-lit and mounted to an ACM (aluminum composite panel) which will be attached to the building. See attached application materials for additional details.

[08:16 pm]  
03:05:56

**COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS**

- Applicant clarified the location of the proposed sign would NOT be on the parapet as stated in the Staff Report but would be on the building wall and that the location is not a primary façade of the building, facing the freeway.
- Commissioners’ discussion on signage precedence regarding these decisions.
- Commissioners expressed concern over the potential damage to historic material.
- Signage applicant did not have a response how the building would be anchored specifically. HDC Staff showed example that mortar joints would be stipulated for anchor points to avoid damage to historic material.
- Commissioners received confirmation from the applicant that OutFront occupies most of the building.

[08:25 pm]  
03:15:56

**ACTION**

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7513 for 2310 Park**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application **WILL BE APPROPRIATE** according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore **ISSUES** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work.

*The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following condition:*

- All mounting brackets shall be installed at mortar joints, not in the brick itself.

Commissioner Hosey– SUPPORT  
Ayes – 7 Nay – 0  
**MOTION CARRIED**

[8:25 PM]  
03:15:56

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** #21-7516 DR  
**VIOLATION NUMBER:** #21-430  
**ADDRESS:** 3747 Tyler (AKA 3745-3747 Tyler)

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Russell Woods-Sullivan HD

**APPLICANT:** David Pakhchanian

**PROPERTY OWNER:** Demp Properties 2020, LLC

**SCOPE OF WORK:** General rehab, windows/doors installed without approval\*

**PROPSAL:**

The applicant provided an application for the proposed scope items. All scope items are work complete unless noted as “Proposed”. See also applicant photos and attachments:

Roof, Fascia Board, Soffits, Gutters/Downspouts:

- Replaced roof with 30-year warrantee asphalt-shingled roof.
- Replaced rotted roof wood with wood.
- Covered soffits with beige-colored vinyl.
- Propose cover fascia board with brown-colored metal.
- Propose all gutters and downspouts replaced with brown-colored metal.

Walls

- Propose to repair all brick with tuck-pointing as needed.

Windows, Doors, Openings:

- Replaced nineteen (19) windows with double-pane, vinyl windows, painted brown to match trim.
  - Front (North) - 4 windows
  - Back (South) – 4 windows
  - Side (East) – 3 Windows
  - Side (West) – 8 windows
- Replaced eleven (11) basement windows with glass block windows.
- Replaced three (3) doors with double doors that have a security gate
  - Front (North) – 2 doors
  - Side (East)– 1 door
- Replaced two (2) rear doors with windows.
- Propose to close all “Windowless openings” by bricking them in.

Porches:

- Propose to replace front steps with same material.
- Propose to replace front porch light with one (1) rectangle porch light.
- Demolished rear wood deck. Propose to leave rear elevation with no deck.

Fencing:

- Replaced east, rear 6-foot tall fence with unstained 6-foot tall privacy fence.
- Replaced south, rear 6-foot tall fence with unstained 6-foot tall privacy fence.

[8:27 PM]  
03:17:56

**COMMISSION (AND APPLICANT) COMMENTS**

- Applicant stated this is his first time, saw the recommendations and wants to correct the project.
- Commission discussed staff report elements, considered brackets to be replaced, wood repaired or replaced.
- Applicant confirmed that there was a removal of the rear balcony and porch.
- Commissioner stated that the applicant has to propose how to rectify what needs to be done.

- HDC coached applicant on what needs to be addressed for a new proposal to address these violations such as operation and profile of the windows and the primary façade is a big deal.
- HDC warned applicant to be careful of work in historic districts.
- Garage was already done by previous owner but remains in violation with the property until it is addressed in future applications.
- HDC advised applicant to include garage in the next application.
- HDC advised that applicant should order windows that fit the openings.
- Applicant stated that they applied for a permit, but HDC staff noted that only a receipt for a permit fee was brought forward, but no BSEED permit was found.

[8:38 PM]  
03:28:56

#### **ACTION ONE**

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7516 for 3747 Tyler**, 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 following items from the proposed application: the removal of the eave's brackets, covering soffits and fascia with vinyl or metal, replacement of nineteen (19) original windows with vinyl windows, removal of rear and side doors and replaced with vinyl panel/siding/windows, and removal of rear porch/balcony WILL NOT BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a DENIAL for the proposed work.

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

- 2) *The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
- 5) *Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.*
- 6) *Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
- 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 A. Johnson – SUPPORT

Ayes – 6      Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**(Commissioner Franklin left the meeting.)**

[8:40 PM]  
03:30:56

**ACTION TWO**

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7516 for 3747 Tyler**, 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 following items from the proposed application: the repair and re-shingling of the roof, tuck-pointing existing brick walls where needed, and installation of 6' rear, wood privacy fence 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 condition:*

- The fence shall be stained or painted a color appropriate to the house, as determined by HDC Staff, within one year of the issuance of this Certificate.

Commissioner Miriani – SUPPORT

Ayes – 6 Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

[8:41 PM]  
03:31:56

• **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #21-7520 JR**

**ADDRESS:** 12746 Broadstreet

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Russell Woods-Sullivan HD

**APPLICANT:** Noah Schneider

**/ PROPERTY OWNER:** Calvin Jude

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Installation solar panels at rooftop

**PROPOSAL:**

As outlined in the submitted proposal, the applicant is seeking to install new solar panels at the building's roof per the following:

- At northeast/rear roof surface, install a 7- panel array which measures 18'x8'-11"
- At southeast/rear roof surface, install a 3-panel array which measures 6'x8'-11"
- At rear garage roof, southern face, install 5-panel array which measures 16'-6"x72.13"

Staff requested that the applicant provide the height of the L-brackets upon which the panels will be mounted. However, the applicant has not provided the requested information as of the date of this report's completion. The solar panels will be a glossy black color. The service panels will be located at the roof surface per the submitted plans.

[8:49 PM]  
03:33:56

**COMMISSION (AND DEVELOPER) COMMENTS**

- Applicant and home owner not present.
- HDC Staff gave overview of the project.
- Commissioners are ok with staff recommendations

[08:50 pm]  
03:39:56

**ACTION**

Commissioner Miriani moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7520 for 12746 Broadstreet**, 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 7-panel, 18'x8'-11" array at the northeast/rear roof surface shall be removed from the proposal. Solar panels shall not be installed at the home's northeast/rear roof surface.
- HDC staff shall be afforded the opportunity to review and approve a revised proposal for the panels proposed for installation at the southern roof surface of the rear garage wing. Should staff determine that the installation does not meet the SOI Standards, they shall forward the proposal to the Commission for review at a regular meeting.
- The applicant shall provide staff with the height of the L-brackets upon which the panels will be mounted prior to the issuance of the COA. Should staff determine that the dimensions not meet the SOI Standards, they shall forward the proposal to the Commission for review at a regular meeting.

Commissioner A. Johnson – SUPPORT  
Ayes – 5      Nay – 1 (Hamilton)  
**MOTION CARRIED**

[08:51 pm]  
03:42:56

• **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: #21-7525 JR**

**ADDRESS:** 1427 Randolph

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Madison-Harmonie HD

**APPLICANT:** Jerome Eagger

**PROPERTY OWNER:** Randolph Capital Partners LLC

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Replace storefront and windows at front elevation

**PROPOSAL:**

Per the submitted documentation, the application seeks this body's approval of the following work items:

- At the front elevation, second and third stories, remove the existing window assemblies including brick moldings and structural mullions. and install new aluminum windows to replicate size, configuration, and function of existing wood windows (See included Quaker Window Shop drawings and details). The aluminum cladding will be black.
- At the front elevation, remove the five southernmost existing non-historic wood storefront panels at first story and replace with a new CR Laurence Palisades Series S90 aluminum bottom rolling sliding folding door system which measures 20'-10" x 8'-4". Framing and doors will be black powder coated aluminum, all glass will be clear tempered insulated with dual silver low-e coating. System will consist of 6 panels that slide and fold to the Right and inside stack with 2 point locks (no exterior access).
- At the front elevation reclad remaining non-historic wood storefront with aluminum, color black per the submitted project narrative, so that its appearance matches the new bifold doors.

[08:51 pm]  
03:42:56

**COMMISSION (AND DEVELOPER) COMMENTS**

- Applicants, Bunia Parker, Dennis Archer Jr., noted that they are an all-African American development team, provided new material and presented their case.
- David Martin, the Applicant's window specialist, spoke about the windows conditions particularly those on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor on the front elevation. Mullions bent on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor is being supported by the plywood.
- Staff maintains that the windows are not beyond repair.
- Commissioners discussed how windows could be repaired from the photos that have been provided. Also, Commissioners observed that the dimensions of the windows are not appropriate.

[09:15 pm]  
04:04:50

**ACTION ONE**

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7525 for 1427 Randolph**, 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 to replace the historic wood windows WILL NOT BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a DENIAL for the proposed work.

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

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

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

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

Commissioner Miriani – SUPPORT

Ayes – 6      Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

[09:14 pm]  
04:04:50

## **ACTION TWO**

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7525 for 1427 Randolph**, 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 work proposed at the first story storefront 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 – 6      Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

[09:16 pm]  
04:06:56

### • **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER :#21-7526 AD**

**VIOLATION NUMBER: #21-466**

**ADDRESS: 1321 Labrosse**

**HISTORIC DISTRICT: Corktown HD**

**APPLICANT: John Biggar, Studiozone, LLC.**

**PROPERTY OWNER: Stephen Peck**

**SCOPE OF WORK: Window and door replacement work done without approval**

#### **PROPOSAL:**

The applicant proposes the following:

#### Front Elevation – Second Floor (Window E)

- Reopen previously enclosed and boarded over window opening. A 4/4 wood double-hung window will be fabricated from salvaged historic wood sash (which had been removed from other openings – top sash will have an arch like the historic windows in situ); wood sash to be painted red.

#### Front Elevation – First Floor (Window F)

- Retain removed and boarded over small window opening adjacent the front door.

#### West Side Elevation – Second Floor (Window A)

- Remove 1/1 vinyl single-hung window; install one Anderson A-series 1/1 wood fiberglass-clad double-hung unit, fiberglass cladding to be painted red.

#### Rear Elevation – Second Floor (Window B)

- Remove 1/1 vinyl single-hung window, install one Anderson A-series 1/1 wood fiberglass-clad double-hung unit, fiberglass cladding to be painted red.

#### Rear Elevation – Second Floor (Window D)

- Removal of one historic, 1/1 wood double-hung window (far right), installation of glass block to remain.

#### Rear Elevation – First Floor (Window C)

- Removal of one historic, 1/1 wood double-hung window, reduction of opening size, and installation of one vinyl awning window to remain, clear glass, vinyl sash to be painted red.

#### Front Elevation – Recessed Porch Entrance

- Replacement of historic wood door with new solid panel door.

[09:16 pm]  
04:06:34

### COMMISSION (AND DEVELOPER) COMMENTS

- Applicant is the designer on this application. The Owner is not present. There was recent change in ownership.
- Applicant focused on areas where there is disagreement with the Staff Report: Window A on the side and Window B in the back.
- Window C is part of a new addition.
- Commissioners discuss E, F, A, as being fine.
- Staff clarified the dimensions of the windows that are being proposed are not matching existing windows.
- Applicant is prepared to recreate windows based on existing dimensions and using wood material. Window A and B.
- Commissioners agree that Window E should be a one over one.
- Applicant asked that drawings could be reviewed by staff for approval.
- The glass block window is ok because it is out of view.
- The side door was also replaced. The applicant may still have the original door which could be fixed. Owner stated safety concerns for the reason to replace glass door with solid door.
- Window E- applicant would make a new, one over one window. HDC and applicant agreed that three new windows, AB&E, would be customized made.

[09:45 pm]  
04:36:22

### ACTION

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7526 for 1321 Labrosse**, 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 rebuilding of a historic wood double-hung sash, as shown in the application, for placement on the front elevation, second floor, where an identical opening was previously located, 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:*

- Drawings confirming the placement, dimensions, and construction of the two new custom wood windows (front elevation window will be one-over-one; rear elevation window will be four-over-four with historic muntin dimensions and profile) will be submitted to staff for review.

Commissioner Hosey – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5      Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

### COMMISSIONER LOCKHART LEFT MEETING

[09:50 pm]  
04:38:56

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** #21-7527  
**ADDRESS:** 1441 Brooklyn (AKA Kaul Glove Building)  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Corktown HD  
**APPLICANT:** John P. Biggar, Integrity Building Group  
**PROPERTY OWNER:** Amelia Zamir, Method Development

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Revision to previously approved proposal for general rehabilitation including window and door replacement

**PROPOSAL:**

The applicant initially presented the general rehabilitation (including window replacement) to the Commission at the 7/8/2020 regular meeting. The application was approved with a few conditions related to the cleaning and painting of the masonry. See previous application and decision letter on the HDC website [here](#).

The applicant has revised the window proposal that was originally approved in 2020 and in the **current** application is seeking the Commission's approval for the proposed revisions to the window configurations and the revised window replacement product from what was originally approved. See application materials for details.

*Note: this staff report was revised on 10/12/21 at 12:15 to reflect the correction that what is referenced as a new stair tower in the report is an existing hoistway and elevator machine room. Any reference to a new stair tower has been struck out. This correction is visible on page 3 and page 6.*

[09:50 pm]  
04:38:56

**COMMISSION (AND DEVELOPER) COMMENTS**

- Applicant described windows and fire-rated walls to satisfy code.
- HDC Staff noted changes that were made to the Staff Report hours before the meeting, changing the recommendation to approve everything.
- George Roberts, the owner, did not have anything to add.
- Commissioners agree with the staff recommendation. Received confirmation that the awning is included in the application as well.

[09:58 pm]  
04:48:50

**ACTION**

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7527 for 1441 Brooklyn**, 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 work projects proposed in the 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**

[10:00pm]  
04:49:34

**XIII CITY PROJECTS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING**

None

**XIV OLD BUSINESS**

[10:00pm]  
04:49:34

- **APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** #21-7475 DR  
**VIOLATION NUMBER:** #21-482  
**ADDRESS:** 848 Chicago  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Boston-Edison HD  
**APPLICANT:** David Haig (Contractor)

**PROPERTY OWNER:** Jim Simpson

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Landscaping wall at front, landscaping at rear, replacement of doors and windows installed without approval

**PROPSAL:**

The applicant provided a complete application for the proposed scope items:

Landscaping (Front and Rear yards) –See also Applicant drawings attached:

- Protect existing weeping mulberry trees
- Remove 10” caliper Norway maple, located 3’ from the southwest of house, due to reported foundation/basement issues
- Relocate five (5) arborvitae to west edge of property and remove eight (8) globe arborvitae, which were newly planted by previous owner and considered too small for scale of front yard.
- Plant new lower canopy trees (see applicant planting plan).
- Install 4’-6” wide concrete front yard walk, concrete steps and with a concrete paver border (8” Unilock Copthorne “Old Oak”).
- Install concrete pavers in rear yard walkways, rear patio using concrete Unilock Richcliff pavers (“Dawn Mist”) with gray banding (“Basalt”).
- Replace existing driveway with concrete brushed finish driveway (1650 SF).
- Add rear turn-around area (210 SF) with Unilock Richcliff pavers.
- Add rear-yard, stacked concrete units, Unilock Rivercrest Wall Series, walls and pillars, the free-standing seat wall will be 14-23” height.
- Add wrought iron handrails at rear steps
- Remove existing limestone steps on driveway side, run storm drainage under steps, replace existing limestone steps. If steps crack, replace steps with new limestone steps to match.
- Replace broken and cracked limestone step with same by front porch
- Install three (3) carriage lights, Bellagio 103" High Bronze Outdoor Light, on 3 new pillars in rear yard.
- Install 47” by 82” fountain at rear patio.
- Install rain garden, plantings and drainage
- Install one (1) steel bike hoop, color black at rear patio

Replaced Rear Windows:

- Replace seven (7) 1<sup>st</sup> floor, rear brick “porch” room windows, which are single pane, sliding aluminum storm windows with no extant windows behind them with Pella Architect Series wood aluminum clad, vented casement windows with mullion pattern matching existing casement windows on north elevation. Affix simulated divided light muntins to the exterior glass surface of these seven (7) windows.
- Restored one (1) rear kitchen storm window with new wood storm window. Sashes remain.
- Replaced three (3) casement windows of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor dormer with Pella Architect Series, vented casement windows with matching mullion pattern. Affix simulated divided light muntins to the exterior glass surface of these three (3) windows.
- Paint trim with Sherwin Williams 2829 classic white.

Replace/Repair Rear Doors:

- Install new Pella entry door to east elevation of the back porch with matching mullion pattern. Affix simulated divided light muntins to the exterior glass surface of this door.
- Repair three (3) existing steel storm doors by removing rust and painting in color SW 2838 Polished Mahogany satin finish, and reinstall.
- Basement door was restored and repainted.
- Paint trim with Sherwin Williams 2829 classic white.

Repair Rear Siding Bay on Second Floor:

- Replace rotted siding and trim with cedar shake shingles with in-kind material.
- Add simple steel supports under the bay. Paint this frame in color SW 2838 Polished Mahogany to match storm doors.

Windows - West Elevation:

- Repair framing header around west elevation basement window, replace trim to match existing trim. Leave dimensions of the window opening unchanged.
- Retain previously installed window with a vinyl, double hung window (black on exterior, white on interior).
- Restore first floor west elevation windows, by repairing bad wood and using linseed oil putty and primer. Restore and replace cracked/broken storm windows.

[10:00 pm]  
04:49:34

**COMMISSION (AND DEVELOPER) COMMENTS**

- HDC Staff represented the material and highlighted changes since the previous applicant and the recommendations.
- The owner stated that they bought this house in early 2018 and they're active in their block club and is the committee chair for the technology committee for the Historic Boston Edison Association. Also stated that they weren't aware that there was a process for approval to restore his home or landscaping.
- Applicant's contactor, David Haig, offered a couple of corrections. He found photos of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows that were casement windows, which were replaced with casement windows that match the configuration of original windows. The front entry pillars has a series of large pillars, the proposed concrete pillars are smaller than those. The screen plantings in front of the wall are seasonal, so they will cover the wall year-round. The concrete parking would match the front porch.
- Staff clarified that the front porch is not part of this application.
- Commissioner Miriani is in favor of this application, with the front elevation of the wall with landscaping. The applicant has taken the concerns raised in the last meeting and is in favor of this application.
- Commissioner K Johnson visited the site. Stated that the location of the regrading and wall is not consistent with the cadence of the front yards of the neighborhood.
- The applicant stated that this was located to address saving the weeping the mulberries and to deal with the storm water outfall. Keeping the mulberries was paramount to the design decision. The applicant states that the wall will not be seen as tall after final grading and planting.

- Commissioner Hamilton agrees with the staff report, the wall changes the neighborhood ambience: its tall, very far forward and wide, almost as wide as the lot. It's a major structure conflicts with the simple design of the house. The proposed remedies such as the parging doesn't minimize the effect very much and the planting is still way too forward in the lot. The whole constructure is way too forward. Also considers what would happen to the character of the neighborhood if everyone did this. It violates Standard 9, in my opinion. Agrees with the design proposal in the rear.
- Discussion on the use of railings in the front yard.
- Commissioners' discussion around precedence that this project sets for the neighborhood.
- Commissioners' discussion on the rear windows. Exterior windows were not present on the rear porch. The rear windows are not a primary elevation, and they are high quality windows. They're consistent. This discussion includes the west basement window as acceptable.

[10:22 pm]  
05:12:50

### **ACTION ONE**

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7475 for 848 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 following items from the proposed application: the removal of the original steps and brick-lined concrete walk, the regrading of the front yard's raised earthwork terrace, and the newly built wall, pillars, light fixtures and railings, screen planting, and the landing at the base of the front yard steps **WILL NOT BE APPROPRIATE** according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore **ISSUES a DENIAL** for the proposed work.

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

- 2) *The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
- 3) *Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.*
- 4) *Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.*
- 5) *Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.*
- 6) *Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*

9) *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

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 – 4 Nay – 1 (Miriani)

**MOTION CARRIED**

[10:30 pm]  
05:19:50

**ACTION TWO**

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #21-7475 for 848 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 all remaining items in the 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 condition:*

- The applicant submit final rear landscape drawings for staff to review prior to permit/approval.
- The applicant submit all light fixture cut sheets for staff to review prior to permit/approval.

Commissioner A. Johnson – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

[10:31pm]  
05:21:44

**XV NEW BUSINESS**

- **Resolution 21-06-** Extension of Resolution 20-02, extending the timeframe of work performed in response to COVID-19 pandemic.

[10:32 pm]  
05:22:14

**COMMISSION (AND DEVELOPER) COMMENTS**

- Commissioners discussion around the June 30, 2022 expiration date, and recommends changing the Resolution to an earlier date.

[10:33pm]  
05:25:14

**ACTION**

Commissioner Miriani moved that:

The HDC adopt Resolution 21-06 with the adjustment to the expiration date as April 30, 2022.

Commissioner Hosey – SUPPORT

Ayes – 5 Nay – 0

**RESOLUTION PASSED**

[10:35 pm]  
05:26:14

**XVI ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Miriani motioned to adjourn the meeting at 10:35pm.

Commissioner Hosey – 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)
- HDC Staff
  - AD- Audra Dye
  - AP- Ann Phillips
  - BC- Brendan Cagney
  - DR- Dan Rieden
  - GL- Garrick Landsberg
  - JR – Jennifer Ross
- Planning & Development Department (PDD)