

**DETROIT HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**

Date: August 9, 2023

Coleman A. Young Municipal Center, 13th Floor, Erma Henderson Auditorium

**AGENDA** (Actual time [audio recording time stamp])

**I CALL TO ORDER** (5:38 p.m.)

Chairperson Franklin called the meeting to order at 5:38 p.m.

**II ROLL CALL** (5:38 p.m.)

<b>HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION</b>		<b>PRESENT</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Najahyia Chinchilla	Commissioner		X
Tiffany Franklin	Chair	X	
James Hamilton	Commissioner	X	
Roderick Hardamon	Commissioner		X
Richard Hosey	Commissioner		X
Alan Machielse	Vice Chair	X	
Adrea Simmons	Commissioner	X	
<b>STAFF</b>			
Timothy Boscarino	PDD	X	
Benjamin Buckley	PDD	X	
Audra Dye	PDD	X	
Garrick Landsberg (Director)	PDD	X	
Daniel Rieden	PDD	X	
Jennifer Ross	PDD	X	

**III APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** (05:39 p.m. [00:3:30])

**ACTION** (5:39 p.m. [00:03:30])

Commissioner Hamilton moved that the agenda be amended to place 2405 Burns on the consent agenda.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: not present

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 4      Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**ACTION** (5:39 p.m. [00:04:00])

Commissioner Hamilton moved that the agenda be approved as amended.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: not present

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 4          Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**IV APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES** (5:40 p.m. [00:04:30])

**ACTION** (5:40 p.m. [00:04:30])

Commissioner Hamilton moved that July meeting minutes be approved.

Commissioner Simmons: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: abstain

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 4          Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**V REPORTS** (5:40 p.m. [00:04:30])

None

**VI APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO CONSENT AGENDA** (5:41 p.m. [00:05:30])

**ACTION** (5:41 p.m. [00:05:30])

Commissioner Hamilton moved that the application on the consent agenda be approved.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5          Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**VII POSTPONED APPLICATIONS** (5:43 p.m. [00:07:00])

None

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

(5:43 p.m. [00:07:00])

None

**IX APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING** (5:44 p.m. [00:08:00])

**APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** 23-8475 (5:44 p.m. [00:08:30])

**ADDRESS:** 3964 W. Lafayette

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Hubbard Farms

**APPLICANT:** Jamie Perez

**OWNER:** Jamie Perez

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Demolish wing, construct new wing

Staff summarized the proposal and recommendation for denial.

Jamie Perez, the applicant, described the deterioration of the addition proposed for demolition.

**Commissioner Hardamon arrived at 5:52.**

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

One member of the public, who did not provide a name, suggested adding an arch to the design to provide symmetry.

**COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Machielse said that there appeared to be structural cracking and deterioration possibly beyond repair, but that the proposed new design did not adequately replicate the character-defining features.

Commissioner Hamilton stressed the importance of maintaining the symmetry of the building, and said there was no evidence the feature was beyond repair.

Commissioners Hamilton and Machielse discussed the visibility of the wing.

**Commissioner Chinchilla arrived at 5:58.**

Commissioner Machielse said that there is not adequate evidence to determine if the wing is beyond repair.

Commissioner Hardamon opined that even if the wing is beyond repair, the new design is still not appropriate.

**ACTION** (6:06 p.m. [00:30:15])

Commissioner Machielse moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application 23-8475 for 3964 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 proposed application **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 application does not include adequate graphic documentation of the proposed addition.
- The proposed work will result in the removal of distinctive materials and alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the property.
- The application does not adequately demonstrate that the distinctive, character-defining west wing which is proposed for demolition is deteriorated beyond repair.
- The proposed new addition does not adequately replicate the distinctive, character-defining west wing that is proposed demolition.

*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 will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Commissioner Hardamon: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: AYE

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 6          Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** 23-8476 (6:10 p.m. [00:34:30])

**ADDRESS:** 949 Chicago

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Boston-Edison

**APPLICANT:** William Finnicum

**OWNER:** Andre Williams

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Conot

Staff summarized the proposed work and the staff recommendation for approval with conditions.

William Finnicum, applicant and architect, described the proposed light fixtures and explained that the tree would be preserved, as shown in the revised site plan.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Gracie Brown, a resident from across the street, spoke in favor of the proposal.

### COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION

Andre Williams, the owner, expressed an intent to preserve the tree.

Commissioner Franklin agreed that the tree should be preserved and suggested that an arborist should be consulted.

Staff suggested that tree protection during construction would also be important.

The applicant stated that “proportional pruning” would help the tree adapt to its new conditions.

Commissioner Hamilton opined that the proposed light fixtures were acceptable.

### **ACTION** (6:31 p.m. [00:55:00])

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application 23-8476 for 949 Chicago Boulevard** 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:*

- That an arborist is consulted for tree protection and the tree protection plan is submitted to staff for review.

Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: AYE

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 6          Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Commissioner Chinchilla left the room.**

**APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** 23-8477 (6:33 p.m. [00:56:30])

**ADDRESS:** 1200 Hubbard

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Hubbard Farms

**APPLICANT:** Chris Frankovich, Husky Homes

**OWNER:** Conor Mendenhall

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Erect rear extension and second-story porch

Staff summarized the proposal with a recommendation of approval with conditions.

The applicant expressed agreement with the staff report and recommended conditions.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

## **COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION**

Several commissioners expressed agreement with the staff report.

### **ACTION (6:38 p.m. [1:01:45])**

Commissioner Simmons moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application 23-8477 for 1200 Hubbard** 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 composite siding material will have a smooth, not raised grain, finish.
- Wood, or wood, aluminum-clad window units, with clear glass, will be selected. Cladding or paint color (if exterior wood finish is selected) will be submitted to staff for review.
- A clear glass sliding door will be selected. Frame color will be submitted to staff for review.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Commissioner Hamilton expressed that the words “clear glass” in the motion should be interpreted to mean without divisions or grilles.

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5          Nays: 0

### **MOTION CARRIED**

**APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** 23-8478 (6:40 p.m. [1:04:00])

**ADDRESS:** 2325 W. Boston

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Boston-Edison

**APPLICANT:** Sterling Howard

**OWNER:** Sterling Howard

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Demolish garage, rebuild front porch, and other exterior rehabilitation items

Staff summarized the proposal and recommendation for approval with conditions.

The applicant, Sterling Howard, expressed agreement with the staff report.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Franklin asked about a landscaping plan. The applicant responded that he will submit a landscaping plan in the future.

**ACTION (ONE)** (6:48 p.m. [1:12:15])

Commissioner Machielse moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application 23-8478 for 2325 W. Boston** 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 present a planting plan for the front yard that addresses the removal of foundation plantings.
- HDC Staff has an opportunity to review and approve the planting plan prior to installation.

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5          Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**X CITY PROJECTS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING** 5:50 p.m. [1:13:45])

None

**XI PUBLIC COMMENT** (5:50 p.m. [1:13:45])

Jogesh Mukherjee asked what determines if an application is subject to public hearing.

Director Landsberg answered that additions, demolitions, and new construction are subject to public hearing, according to the City Code.

**XII APPLICATIONS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING** (6:53 p.m. [1:17:30])

**APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** 23-9479 (6:53 p.m. [1:17:45])

**ADDRESS:** 2010 Edison

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Boston-Edison

**APPLICANT:** Clifford Terry

**OWNER:** Deborah Vinson

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Replace built-in box gutters with hung gutters

### COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION

Deborah Vinson, the owner described water infiltration that has occurred since at least 2009 and described difficulty in finding a contractor able repair the existing system. The owner introduced Clifford Terry, who proposes to replace the existing box gutters with hung gutters.

Commissioner Franklin expressed that the cornice was an important character-defining feature and was not convinced that it was beyond repair.

Deborah Vinson showed additional pictures not included with the application.

Clifford Terry described the condition of the existing gutters and stated he would not be able to repair them.

Director Landsberg asked if the problem was caused by the condition of the metal lining within the interior of the box gutter.

Commissioner Machielse suggested that the condition described was repairable.

### **ACTION (ONE)** (7:17 p.m. [1:40:00])

Commissioner Machielse moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application 23-8479 for 2010 Edison** and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the replacement of the original built-in gutters **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 submission does not indicate that the original built-in gutters are deteriorated beyond repair/that their repair is technically or financially infeasible.
- The proposed new K-style aluminum gutters proposed for installation at the front elevation will obscure or possibly lead to the removal of portions of the decorative stepped wood fascia and will change the geometry of the distinctive character-defining eaves and cornice.

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

1. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
4. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will

be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Commissioner Simmons: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5      Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**ACTION (TWO)** (7:18 p.m. [1:41:45])

Commissioner Machielse moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application 23-8479 for 2010 Edison** and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the remaining work items **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 will provide staff with a more detailed description regarding the areas of wood that will be replaced and the manner in which the wood will be replaced. If staff determines that any aspect of this work item does not meet the Standards, it will be forwarded to the Commission for review at a future monthly meeting.

Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5      Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Commissioner Franklin left the room, assigning Commissioner Machielse to chair the meeting.**

**APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** 23-8480 (7:20 p.m. [1:44:00])

**ADDRESS:** 104 Edmund Place

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Brush Park

**APPLICANT:** Robert Berro

**OWNER:** Maxwell Morgan and Dominic Gilette

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Alter front porch

## COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION

Dominic Gillette and Gina Danetti, representing the applicant, described the rationale for replacing the porch and the four columns. The work has begun but is not yet finished. The applicants stated that the columns were inspired by those on other buildings in the area.

Commissioner Machielse stated that the wood should be painted.

Commissioners and the applicant discussed a prior Certificate of Appropriateness, issued in 2019, to repair the porch that had been built in 2010. The current application goes beyond the CoA to replace certain elements, including the columns.

Several Commissioners suggested that the current porch, installed without approval, would be appropriate with some changes to the columns and other elements.

### **ACTION (ONE)** (7:36 p.m. [2:00:00])

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #23-8480 for 104 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 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 porch that was constructed without HDC approval is incompatible with the building's historic character as the current bright white, bulky, square porch columns, the current newel posts, deck skirting, and stringers present an awkward incongruent appearance and is better suited for a modern home versus this carefully detailed, late 19<sup>th</sup> century, Victorian/Ruskinian Gothic style dwelling.

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

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

Commissioner Hardamon: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: not present

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 4            Nays: 0

**APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** 23-8482 (7:38 p.m. [02:02:00])

**ADDRESS:** 630 Virginia Park

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** New Center Area

**APPLICANT:** Joe Guadagnino

**OWNER:** Joe Guadagnino

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Replace front door, transom, and sidelights

## COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION

**Commissioner Machielse called a recess at 7:39 p.m.**

**Commissioner Franklin returned.**

**The meeting resumed at 7:44 p.m.**

**ACTION** (7:44 p.m. [02:08:30])

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application 23-8482 for 630 Virginia 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 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 existing doorway surround (i.e., sidelights, transoms, and associated trim) is a distinctive historic feature, consisting of historic materials, that has not been shown to be deteriorated beyond repair.
- The historic (removed without approval) door also constitutes a distinctive feature and materials that have not been shown to be deteriorated beyond repair.
- The proposed new doorway unit introduces a design, with smaller glazed areas and larger wood panels, that does not adequately match the historic doorway.

*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.
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 where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be documented by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Joe Guadagnino and Alyce Couts, applicant and owner, expressed an intent to restore the sidelights and transom, rather than replace, and to replace the non-historic front door with a new door similar in appearance to the front door seen in historic photos.

Commissioner Hamilton agreed that the door should be replaced but the sidelights and transom should be retained.

Commissioners Hamilton and Hardamon noted that if the Commission issues a Denial, the scope of work described by the applicant could be approved with existing staff authority.

Commissioner Simmons: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE  
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE  
Commissioner Hardamon: AYE  
Commissioner Hosey: not present  
Commissioner Machielse: AYE  
Commissioner Simmons: AYE  
Ayes: 5        Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Commissioner Franklin resumed chairing the meeting.**

**APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** 23-8483 (8:54 p.m. [1:22:30])

**ADDRESS:** 2432 W. Boston

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Boston-Edison

**APPLICANT:** Steven Witkowski, John McCarter Construction

**OWNER:** Yukon Consulting LLC

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Rehabilitate Dwelling and Garage

**COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION**

Steven Witkowski, representing the applicant, stated that they would accept the recommendations regarding windows and cladding.

Several commissioners expressed agreement with the staff report.

**ACTION (ONE)** (7:56 p.m. [1:25:30])

Commissioner Simmons moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #23-8483 for 2432 W. Boston** and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the replacement of windows numbered 1, 2, 47, 53–56, both garage windows, the replacement of previously existing stucco cladding and existing wood cladding, and the replacement of the front entry door **WILL NOT BE APPROPRIATE** according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore **ISSUES a DENIAL** for the proposed work.

*The Commission's reason for denial is that:*

- The windows are historic materials that have not been shown to be deteriorated beyond repair.
- For windows 47 and 53, the proposed work replaces nonrectangular windows with rectangular windows.
- The wood cladding is a historic material, and the wood dormers, bay windows, and rear-facing gable end are a distinctive feature; they have not been shown to be deteriorated beyond repair.
- The lost stucco was a historic material, and it was not shown to have been deteriorated beyond repair prior to having been removed; also, it can be feasibly replaced in kind.
- The proposed work would replace two historic materials (wood shingles and true stucco) with a different material (fiber-cement siding and panels) of different textures and other visual qualities.
- The existing front door is a distinctive feature that has not been shown to be beyond feasible repair.
- The proposed replacement, lacking the battens, recessed panels, and square window of the historic door, lacks the necessary texture and depth to serve as an appropriate replacement.

*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 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, other visual qualities, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be documented by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5          Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**ACTION (Two)** (7:58 p.m. [2:22:00])

Commissioner Simmons moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application 23-8483 for 2482 W. Boston** 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 remaining work items 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:*

- Existing historic window trim will be retained. If it is deteriorated beyond repair, its replacement will be subject to approval by staff.
- The soffit panels may be replaced only to the extent that they have deteriorated beyond repair. The new soffit and trim panels will be wood rather than synthetic fiber-cement panels and will be painted a color selected from Color System D or another color approved by staff.
- The color of the proposed rear (south) doors will be a color selected from Color System D or another color approved by staff.
- The selection of garage doors will be subject to approval by staff.
- The color of gutters will be a color selected from Color System D or another color approved by staff.

Commissioner Hardamon: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE  
Commissioner Hosey: not present  
Commissioner Machielse: AYE  
Commissioner Simmons: AYE  
Ayes: 5            Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** 23-8484 (8:00 p.m. [2:25:00])

**ADDRESS:** 2485 Burns

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Indian Village

**APPLICANT:** Terry Swafford

**OWNER:** Jared Stasik

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Alter front porch

**COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION**

**Commissioner Franklin recused herself from this item, assigning Commissioner Machielse to chair the meeting, and left the room.**

Terry Swafford, the applicant, expressed disagreement with the staff report and argued that the proposed work is appropriate.

Commissioners Hamilton, Simmons, and Machielse suggested that the proposed curvilinear design is not appropriate, but that an expansion of the porch would be acceptable.

**ACTION** (8:15 p.m. [2:39:30])

Commissioner Simmons moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #23-8484 for 2485 Burns**, 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, and therefore **ISSUES a DENIAL** for the proposed work.

*The Commission's reason for denial is that:*

- The proposed replacement of cast stone and limestone stone decking of the porch, by introducing concrete pavers and new limestone in a circular form destroys historic distinctive character defining features of the classically inspired building.
- The introduction of wingwalls adds a new element that obscures and diminishes the distinctive, character-defining features of the Georgian Revival architecture.
- The expansion of the scale of the lower step and sidewalk are at a scale and width that diminishes the proportions of the approach and entrance to the building, thereby breaking the composition and complexity of the façade elements by over-extending the modest foundation that supports these character-defining features of the entrance.
- Concrete pavers are not an appropriate substitute to clay-fired brick pavers in the Indian Village Historic District.

*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. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Commissioner Chinchilla: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: not present

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 4      Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** 23-8441 (9:13 p.m. [03:41:00])

**ADDRESS:** 686 Selden

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** Willis-Selden Local

**APPLICANT:** Bethany Howard, City of Detroit General Services Department

**OWNER:** GW1 Cass LLC

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Paint mural

#### **COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION**

Bethany Howard, representing the applicant, expressed a desire to retain the mural (painted without approval). The applicant explained the City Walls program, under which the mural had been painted.

**Commissioner Franklin returned.**

Commissioner Hamilton noted that the mural has painted over distinctive features of the building, and that painting unpainted masonry is rarely appropriate in a historic district. The Commissioner also noted that murals are often approved if they don't cover historic features.

Commissioner Machielse said that it is difficult to remove paint from masonry without damaging the surface.

**ACTION (ONE)** (8:32 p.m. [2:55:30])

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #23-8486 for 686 Selden**, 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 painting of a mural on the southernmost west-facing bay **WILL NOT BE APPROPRIATE**.

*The Commission's reason is that:*

- The face brick, stone blocks and protruding trim are a component of a comprehensive design at the building's first floor which wraps both sides of the structure.
- The mural obscured and distorted the features of the wall and altered a distinctive character-defining feature of the building.

But, it is without substantial detriment to the public welfare and without substantial derogation from the intents and purposes of this article, and where condition 4 is met, therefore under Section 21-2-78 the Commission hereby issues a Notice to Proceed as removing the mural would not be in the interest of the majority of the community.

Commissioner Hardamon: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5      Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**ACTION (TWO)** (8:38 p.m. [03:02:00])

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #23-8486 for 686 Selden**, 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 remaining work items **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 Hardamon: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5          Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Commissioner Franklin resumed chairing the meeting.**

## **XII CITY PROJECTS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING**

None

## **XIV OLD BUSINESS**

**APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER:** 23-8404 (8:40 p.m. [03:04:00])

**ADDRESS:** 8022 Kerchival

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** West Village

**APPLICANT:** Michael Sklenka, Subject Studio

**OWNER:** David Spencer, National Solutions, Inc.

**SCOPE OF WORK:** Window replacement on side and rear elevations

### **COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION**

Director Landsberg gave a reminder that the windows were previously determined by the Commission to not be beyond repair; this is a revised application.

Mollie Decker, Michael Sklenka, and Dave Spencer described attempts to identify a contractor to repair the historic windows. The applicant proposed that they be allowed to replace side and rear windows if they retain and restore the front windows. The applicant elaborated to describe the condition of the windows and the difficulty of their repair.

Commissioner Hamilton opined that while the cost estimates provided by the applicant were high, it was likely that an appropriate scope of work would be accomplished with a lower cost.

Director Landsberg and Commissioner Franklin opined that the quoted costs did not seem excessive.

**ACTION (ONE)** (9:13 p.m. [03:36:45])

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #23-8404 for 8022 Kercheval**, 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.

### **MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF SUPPORT**

**ACTION (TWO)** (9:14 p.m. [03:37:30])

Commissioner Machielse moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #23-8404 for 8022 Kercheval**, 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, and therefore ISSUES a DENIAL for the proposed work.

*The Commission's reason for denial is that:*

- The windows are distinctive character-defining features.
- The Commissioners' physical assessment confirms the existing windows are not deteriorated beyond repair.
- The submitted estimates are for full restoration, which goes beyond the repair needed to make the windows operable and functional.

*The Commission's reason 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.
- 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 Hardamon: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5      Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**ACTION (THREE) (9:17 p.m. [3:41:30])**

Commissioner Machielse moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application #23-8404 for 8022 Kercheval**, 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 remaining work items, including repair of windows at the front elevation, 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 brick will be recessed approximately one inch from the face of the exterior masonry wall.

Commissioner Simmons: SUPPORT

Commissioner Chinchilla: not present

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Hardamon: AYE

Commissioner Hosey: not present

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5      Nays: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**XV    NEW BUSINESS**

None

**XVI   ADJOURNEMENT**

Commissioner Machielse moved to adjourn.

Commissioner Simmons: SUPPORT

**MOTION CARRIED**

The Commission adjourned at 9:20 p.m.