MINUTES
DETROIT HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
February 12, 2025
Coleman A. Young Municipal Center, Suite 808

I CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Franklin called the meeting to order at 4:37 p.m. Commissioners Franklin, Hamilton, Machielse, and Marquez were in the meeting at that time.

At 4:39 p.m., Commissioner King arrived.

II ROLL CALL (4:39 p.m.)

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION		PRESENT	ABSENT
Tiffany Franklin	Chair	X	
James Hamilton	Commissioner	X	
Marcus King	Commissioner	X	
Alan Machielse	Vice Chair	X	
William Marquez	Commissioner	X	
STAFF			
Timothy Boscarino	PDD	X	
Audra Dye	PDD	X	
Garrick Landsberg (Director)	PDD	X	
Daniel Rieden	PDD	X	
Jennifer Ross	PDD	X	

III APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (04:40 p.m.)

ACTION (4:40 p.m.)
Commissioner Hamilton moved to amend the agenda, and to move two applications to the consent agenda. Those moved applications would be 6134 Second Avenue application and 232 West Grand River.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0
MOTION PASSED

Staffperson Jennifer Ross asked to add a new item under New Business. The item would be Phased Permits as it relates to Application 2023-8272, 2023-8297, and 2023-8298 for the properties at 3606 Lincoln, 3618 Lincoln, and 1352 Brainard. Director Landsberg clarified that this would be one agenda item called "Phased Permits."

ACTION (4:43 p.m.)
Commissioner Machielse moved to add an item of discussion under new business regarding phased permitting.

Commissioner Marquez: SUPPORT.

Chair asked for roll; Director Landsberg requested clarification as to whether this motion is also for approving the agenda. Chair agreed that this motion is for the amendment and the approval of the agenda as amended.

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0
MOTION PASSED

IV APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

ACTION (4:44 p.m.)
Commissioner Machielse moved to approve the January 2025 HDC Regular Meeting minutes.
Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

V REPORTS

- Director Landsberg appreciates everyone's patience with the size of the agenda. We have been a staffmember down for a while. We hope to return to full staff complement as early as early March.

VI APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

ACTION (4:46 p.m.)
Commissioner Hamilton moved to approve the consent agenda as modified.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Director Landsberg restated the motion as a motion to approve the consent agenda, consisting of 232 W Grand River and 6134 Second Avenue cases:

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED

The chair stated that that means that if applicants were in the audience for those two cases, they can leave if they like. The applicants for those two cases will be receiving their certificates of appropriateness in about a week's time.

VII POSTPONED APPLICATIONS

None

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

None

IX APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2024-00694 (4:48 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 701-703 W. Canfield
HISTORIC DISTRICT: West Canfield
SCOPE OF WORK: Approve alteration to previous design by permitting a structure with a roof as proposed (work started without approval)

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
Scott Lowell and Marc Grassi in person and Lis Knibbe and Kristine Kidorf online. All sworn in.

PUBLIC COMMENT (4:55 p.m.)
Doug and Rosanne Pattison, next-door neighbors, the rear structure is not very beautiful and with a roof, there will probably be more shade added to their yard; there are also violations on the west side—could staff provide comment about those violations?

Commissioner Machielse offered that there are a number of letters in support of this project; all are online.

No additional comments in person or online; chair closed the public comment for this item at 4:55 p.m. Director Landsberg stated that the staff takes violations seriously and has forwarded any violations to the Building Department.

ACTION (4:56 p.m.)
Commissioner Machielse moved that:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2024-00694 for 701-703 W. Canfield**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the

2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application WILL BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS for the proposed work.

Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE
Ayes:5 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2025-00693 (4:57 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 445 Ledyard Unit 6-7
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Cass Park
APPLICANT: David Sampson in person and Bert Jenkins, J.R. Watkins, Marie Racine, Carl Bentley online, sworn in.
OWNER:
SCOPE OF WORK: Expand parking area

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
Staff Tim Boscarino presented staff report. Mr. Sampson stated that the organization was fortunate enough to build housing on site but that building took some former parking lot so they'd like to expand lot for staff parking. Designer/contractor affirmed that the staff report was accurate. Commissioner clarified location of lights.

PUBLIC COMMENT (5:03 p.m.)
None

ACTION (5:04 p.m.)
Commissioner King moved that:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00693 for 445 Ledyard, Unit 6-7**, 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 section of sandstone curb that is removed will be retained and reused to infill the gap to the west of the curb cut.

Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE
Ayes:5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2024-00709 (5:04 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 19410 Warrington
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Sherwood Forest
APPLICANT: DeJuan McClendon
OWNER:
SCOPE OF WORK: Rebuild and expand garage, replace front entry door and French doors

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
Staff presented staff report. Owner described that the historic doors were removed before he bought the house.

PUBLIC COMMENT (5:12 p.m.)
None

ACTION (5:20 p.m.)
Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2024-00594 and HDC2024-00709 for 19410 Warrington**, 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 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:

- Smooth-faced clapboard siding is used on the garage's gable walls.
- The garage doors will be painted; the color will be submitted for review and approval by HDC staff.
- The dwelling's front door will be the stained wood door with arched leaded glass opening. Should another door be considered by the applicant, it will be submitted to staff for review.
- New steel French doors shall not have a distinctly contemporary design, but will have a design subject to approval by staff.
- The new French doors may be steel or wood as the applicant prefers.

Commissioner Marquez: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: Not present
Ayes:5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2025-00028 (5:23 p.m.)

ADDRESS: 3020 Iroquois
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Indian Village
SCOPE OF WORK: Erect dwelling

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
Staff presented staff report. Robert Clarke attended in person and was sworn in. *[Discussed slippery elm and mulberry and that they are intertwined.]*

PUBLIC COMMENT (5:28 p.m.)
None

ACTION
Commissioner Marquez moved that:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00028 for 3020 Iroquois**, 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 proposed alternative painted brick depicted on page 13 of the submitted drawings shall be used; painted CMU shall not be used.
- The elm tree will have no restrictions other than it will be replaced with a new shade tree that is a large hardwood shade tree species.
- The final selection of garage door shall prioritize an inconspicuous design, subject to review by staff.

Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes:5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2024-00666 (5:38 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 808-816 Virginia Park Ave.
HISTORIC DISTRICT: New Center Area
SCOPE OF WORK: Erect multi-family dwellings

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
Director presented staff report. Was a parking lot for hospital (now demolished). Proposed is a multi-family development—two buildings. Neighborhood is single-family; proposed development is large, out of proportion, materials unrelated to neighborhood, neighborhood has pitched roofs and this proposal is for a flat roof. Proposal is not compatible with Standards and Elements of Design, and so a denial is recommended for the Certificate of Appropriateness. However, Detroit Land Bank, a separate authority

from City government, without the Planning Department's knowledge, responded to this offer to buy the property and awarded the property to this developer and design team, apparently without Planning Department's review which is supposed to be required. The Department was surprised to see this development and shared concerns with development team. PDD was then reminded that in 2018 or so, the PDD had socialized and communicated to the neighborhood the potential for development for the lot across the street where the hospital used to stand. That slide is in the submitted materials and so the conceptual idea for the parcel at the southwest corner was to introduce density, infill, and possibly mixed use and affordable housing (a public good). Historic district staff showed that original concept to the developer, and this team to their credit, revised their design to be much closer to that design with the hope that that revision might be granted a notice to proceed because of substantial community benefit. Planning and Development Department is not prepared at this time to issue a recommendation to support this project. Developer has been requested to meet more with staff and community. Applicant wanted to hear from the commission even without that department support. Steven Flum and Shahin Mustafa were present representing the project and sworn in. Mr. Flum stated that the proposed is compatible and meets the Elements of Design and Standards. Ms Mustafa outlined community engagement efforts and design revisions based on community feedback.

PUBLIC COMMENT (5:59 p.m.)
Steve Waldrop, owns 4 properties on Virginia Park, and president of Virginia Park Block Club. Believes this proposed development is too dense for the zoning. For 21 units, city should require 32 spaces for parking and this falls short. The proposal is too far forward and the rest of the neighborhood has uniform setbacks.

Tracey Reese owns property adjacent. Has concerns. There was a mention of her fence encroaching on their property by 18". How would that be resolved? Would there be a privacy wall? Parking and density are issues. This is a residential neighborhood. The 2018-2019 plan was rejected by the block club. Townhomes on the south side was approved by the block club, but this large multifamily proposal was not. Also will be difficult to manage this project and the street's brick surface repairs at the same time.

Organ Smith, owner of property at 837 _____, right behind this property proposed to be built, will they block the alley off? He and many neighbors use alley. During construction, what will the times of construction be? What will working hours be for noise on site?

Hiram McGrady, contemporary style of building doesn't look like the houses. Some houses were from 1897 and the proposed design will not complement the neighborhood and the spacing and entries are not compatible. Entry doors, porches, and setback are all issues. He bought his house because it is in the historic district. This design does not make sense for a historic district, without any efforts to make colors, materials, etc be more compatible. Should not be approved.

Donna McGrady thanks the developers for coming to the Block Club meeting. If pictures had been shown earlier, communication and process would have been better. GM came and rehabbed many houses in the neighborhood (30 blocks) and we need to respect and honor that investment and our history. Bricks would better blend, brown would blend in better. Wants the development and investment but wants it to blend in.

Jodi Wise: there was a meeting in 2018 with PDD and two buildings were shown. One person supported the apartment building and everyone else supported the townhomes. Block Club never agreed to anything at that meeting. Feels bad for Shahin because the community had never agreed to the big building. Massing and setback are issues. Neighborhood is surprised by the proposed development.

Jessica Goletz, resident at 870 Seward. The design is a concern—not consistent or complementary of the neighborhood's character. Worried that the proposed building would negatively impact the neighborhood especially if this design sets a precedent and also worries about affordability in the neighborhood.

Russell Baltimore, Planning and Development Design Review. This project has evolved since last year when he first saw it. It is getting closer he thinks that might be compatible here. Couldn't say he would sign off now, and he did express that to the developer. R3 district and the proposal is much denser and covering more of the site; these things would have to go to the zoning board of appeals. Setbacks in the front is an issue—want the historic buildings and not the new ones to shine. A contemporary building has to be done in a way that makes the houses in the district shine. This design doesn't have quite the attention to detail that is needed. He wants to continue to work with them to get a design that won't detract from the district. There are certain things that need to happen to make sense in an R3.

6:20 p.m.: public hearing now closed. Steven Flum stated that the proposal meets the required parking spaces. Ms Mustafa stated that they were shown images of contemporary designs and didn't receive any feedback before now. The development team feels shocked. They have engaged the community.

Director Landsberg stated that he and Russell Baltimore have met with the developer and the architect in probably a dozen meetings in the summer and fall and have recommended that they undertake a community engagement effort on an ongoing basis and the neighbors are saying the first time they saw a design was in January. It is the developer's responsibility to engage with the neighborhood and build community support for the project and to make that support known to the Planning Department and the Historic District Commission.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:

New Center is a large and diverse district—might not be out of place elsewhere in the district. This street however, is largely single-family and this development doesn't fit specifically here. A multifamily townhouse could perhaps work on this site. The building is much too close to the street. It doesn't respect the building lines of the other structures on Virginia Park. This building would block views of the historic buildings from the sidewalk or street. So that site plan needs to be revised to address context. There are also issues with materiality and perhaps form and mass issues. The roof is different from neighbors.

This design seems to have nothing in common with the district and neighborhood—stoops, porches, flat roof, levels of floors, scale all different from existing. Gentler density is probably required, but the design is so jarring that commissioner doesn't feel prepared to have that conversation.

Commissioner feels like there is a balance in this building's scale and it holds the corner—it could maybe be proud of setback, but it might need to be designed with craft and style. How do we honor guiding documents? A district can have its historic stars and some diversity of newer buildings in its stock.

Commissioner feels that this is too much building for this particular corner. The demolitions and vacant spaces do create an issue. Probably will need multifamily buildings on both these corners, but these buildings need to be respectful of historic buildings and modest.

Commissioner clarifies that he thinks modern and historic can be side by side but he believes that this building needs a little more attention and detail so it can be contextual.

Director Landsberg observed illuminating feedback happening now that the Planning Department was hoping to happen. It is now happening, and that is a good thing. He would advocate to bring this project to the historic district commission in a month or two to give those conversations time to develop.

Chair sums up that this conversation was productive and can continue in the community so some of these concerns can be discussed further.

ACTION (6:42 p.m.)
Commissioner King moved:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00036 for 808-816 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 proposed new building requires a typology and massing that is contrary to the defined characteristics of Virginia Park Avenue, which is universally characterized by single-family dwellings set off by spacious lawns.
- The new work, while differentiated from the older houses, is incompatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features established by the existing Virginia Park Avenue historic context.
- Based on the historic context of Virginia Park, the proportion of the front façade should appear taller than wide or wider than tall, with an overall neutral appearance. The proposed attached dwellings are substantially wider than tall, very far from neutral.
- Cement panels with metal reveal trim are not reasonably related to a historic material precedent on Virginia Park Avenue. The extensive use of these modern panels on these proposed buildings makes them the default primary expression and substantially at odds with the historic context.
- The proposal does not incorporate "ornate" architectural detailing as specifically called out in the Elements of Design for Virginia Park.
- Flat roofs are not compatible with the existing character of Virginia Park, which is universally marked by pitched and complex roof forms of various types.
- The proposed setback does not align with the wall of continuity and the existing rhythm of established setbacks of the Virginia Park Avenue historic corridor.
- The scale of the facades in the proposal are not compatible with the scale/complexity of the facades on the historic buildings along Virginia Park.
- The directional expression of the proposed front elevations is not compatible with the overall "neutral" directional expression of the houses on Virginia Park.
- The degree of complexity in the facades of the existing houses on Virginia Park requires a similar complexity in a historically compatible new structure, independent of the style, which is not achieved by the proposal.
- The proposal is not compatible with the general environmental character of Virginia Park Avenue, which is marked by large residences set off on lawns in a low density setting.

and therefore, 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.
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.

and Elements of Design 2, 7, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, and 22.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE
Commissioner Simmons: AYE
Ayes:5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

X CITY PROJECTS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2024-00004 (6:47 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 2900 St. Antoine
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Brewster-Wheeler Recreation Center
SCOPE OF WORK: Construct parking lot and associated landscape supporting adjacent development

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
Staff presented staff report. New hardscape and landscape and park area in support of larger rehab plan.

Don Tilicki, MHT Construction Project Manager, and Andy Martin, present and sworn in. Pavilion and dumpster enclosure will be in the district.

PUBLIC COMMENT: none; public comment closed.

DISCUSSION: none.

ACTION (6:55 p.m.)
Commissioner Machielse moved:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00004 for 2900 St. Antoine**, 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:

- HDC staff shall be afforded the opportunity to review and approve the final details for the dumpster enclosure and pavilion prior to their erection.

Commissioner King: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

Advisory role of commission:
Commission remained mute. Did not make a motion. Later, about 7:03 p.m., commission had to come back to this and make a motion, per Director Landsberg's direction.

ACTION (7:03 p.m.)
Commissioner Hamilton moved:
The commission finds that the proposed project at **2900 St. Antoine** will not have a demonstrable effect on the Brewster-Wheeler Recreation Center Historic District, and that the determination of the commission be reported to the Mayor and City Council for their consideration.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE
Ayes: 5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

XI PUBLIC COMMENT (6:57 pm)

None

XII APPLICATIONS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING (6:58 p.m.)

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2024-00661 (6:59 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 258 Eliot
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Brush Park
SCOPE OF WORK: Replace wood windows with vinyl windows (work completed without approval)

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
The applicant and the owner are not present. The commissioners state their agreement with the staff report.

ACTION (6:59 p.m.)
Commissioner Hamilton moved that:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2024-00661 for 258 Eliot**, 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:

- White vinyl windows with between-the-glass grids offer a bright white, flat appearance and the forward placement of the window sash within the dormers creates an additional flat surface.

- *Material* - the proposed vinyl windows are not "consistent with the general characteristics of a historic window of the type and period" and are not "compatible with the overall historic character of the building".
- *Color* - Availability of frame colors must be considered as most replacement windows have prefinished exterior cladding. Many replacement windows have bright white frames, a popular color in contemporary architecture, which not a color often used on 19th and 20th century buildings. Bright white window frames are not compatible with the historic character of the building.
- *Placement* – Historically, windows are recessed within walls to differing depths, depending on the exterior wall material. Windows within brick clad walls, sit deeply within the window opening, but even with wood framed/clad walls, windows are still recessed from exterior walls. This creates a differential of wall planes, so each element (wall and window) has equal visual impact on an elevation.

and therefore, the proposed work fails to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, specifically Standards:

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

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2025-00012 (7:06 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 644 Selden
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Willis Selden
SCOPE OF WORK: Add new primary entry door, install awnings, and replace sign

Chair reminds that applications for 232 W Grand River and 6134 2nd Ave were both moved to the consent agenda and approved.

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
Anthony Lombardo, present. Ryan Smith, present. Both sworn in. Anthony is a chef at She-Wolf and they'll make southern Italian cuisine and are already part of the community and ask for the commission's advice. Ryan Smith, Patrick Thompson Designs, designer and architect on the project. The signage they propose to remove is a blade sign that was not on this building, but was moved from 666 Selden. The landlord will take that and salvage it for reuse within the complex. The metal awnings on the Selden Street façade were a staff concern—they are willing to do canvas there—and concern that architectural details would be covered. They think that the height and distance would allow the details to be seen. The

side entry is the proposed primary entry. Proposing new entry doors. This property has been a couple different restaurants the past couple years. Using the main door poses interior design challenges, so they propose that the entry door be relocated to the courtyard. Tile and limestone proposed could be struck and just paint existing brick instead.

Commissioner expressed concern that the landmark sign from 666 Selden should go back to 666 Selden and be visible. It has been a neighborhood landmark for decades. It is at 644 because when the owners of those properties were rehabilitating them, the owners expressed to the commission that the tenants at 666 Selden didn't want the sign. The commission allowed for the sign to be removed and placed at 644, even though staff advised against that. Commissioner acknowledges staff was right about that and stated that because that sign was a landmark for 60 years, he'd like to see the sign return to 666 and have a place of prominence. He stated that it is not about the business in the building now—it is that the sign was associated with a business for 60 years; he doesn't want to see the sign relocated to a rear location. Staff clarified that the application is to remove the sign from 644 without a proposal to reinstall it anywhere. Commissioner stated that the blade sign is not appropriate for the architecture at 644 and wonders if any blade sign would be appropriate for 644. A blade sign belongs over a sidewalk. If the sign comes down, would it then be able to be reinstalled as is? It was allowed in 2019, but there have been zoning ordinance updates since then. Invest Detroit and Jon Carlson own the building in partnership. *[More discussion about sign and appropriate placement and appropriate application from owners instead of tenants.]* Entry relocating may be okay, wraparound awning is not in agreement with staff recommendations. Wraparound awning helps direct. That front façade is a unit. When you put the awning across the front, you will obscure the character of the lower windows. This building is not like commercial buildings that have storefront windows that would historically get awnings. This building is austere and its face is character-defining and a feature. No awnings should go there on the Selden face. Black paint on the entablature was not approved and proposal is to remove that paint. Chef wants to rebrand business from three failed restaurants and needs to guide guests to side door which is new main entry. Commission says their job is to protect the building and its historic materials and character and the proposed awning covers the keystone element above the windows and those are character-defining features of the building. Those elements are three dimensional, and the building is historic. Because this building has the pedestrian courtyard next to it, the pedestrian will see that side of the building where your main entry will be. Playing up that corner and side will draw people to it—the building almost acts as a corner building. Putting that design focus on that side door will draw people to it. Chef wants to demonstrate that the restaurant is NEW—that's really important to a restaurant. Commissioners are open to the idea of a new element on that plaza side, and other elements could be placed on the Selden side that would help with wayfinding.

ACTION (7:47 p.m.)
Commissioner Hamilton moved that:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00012 for 644 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 that the proposed work 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 Commission issues the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions:

- With respect to the awnings:
    - The awnings shall not extend onto the Selden façade.
- With respect to the replacement of the existing neon blade sign:

  - The historic neon sign has achieved the status of a landmark in its own right, apart from 644 Selden/the building to which it is attached, and is recognized as a focal point in the neighborhood.
  - The historic neon sign is characteristic of a specific period within the district's history and remains a good representative of a "great twentieth-century contribution to the signmaker's art."
  - The historic neon sign is one of the few remaining examples of its type within the historic district
  - The sign therefore is a distinctive character-defining feature of the neighborhood itself and the immediate environs of 644 Selden
  - The sign may be removed from 644 Selden façade with the condition that there is a plan for its reinstallation in a location on Selden that preserves it as a landmark in the neighborhood, subject to staff review and approval.
- The mural proposed for installation at the west side façade shall not expand outside of the boundaries of the current painted mural and shall not encroach onto brick which is currently unpainted
- The unapproved black paint shall be removed from the limestone door surround at the building's front/south elevation. The applicant shall use the gentlest means possible to avoid damaging the limestone during the removal of the paint.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: ABSTAIN
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE
Ayes: 5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2025-00015 (7:54 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 3774 Cortland
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Russell Woods - Sullivan
SCOPE OF WORK: Replace wood windows (work completed without approval) with wood and vinyl or aluminum-clad wood windows

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
Kevin Fuqua, owner of the property; Jason Floarea, general contractor; and John Nova at Metro Homes are present and were sworn in. Project is in Stop Work status at the moment. Propose new Lincoln wood installation on front façade and keep installed windows on sides and back, and repair cedar shake and stained glass unit on front in gable. *Discussion of windows that were on site and proper procedure in a historic district; window conditions before their removal; historic windows need to be repaired, weatherized, maintained, and a storm window helps.* Properly weatherized wood windows with storms perform as well as new window units. Also, most heat loss does not occur from windows and doors.
Proposal 1: replicating leaded glass windows on front on both stories in hopes you could keep vinyl on other three facades.
Proposal 2: replace all vinyl windows with aluminum-clad wood;

Discussion of options, costs.

ACTION (8:28 p.m.)
Commissioner Machielse moved that:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00015 for 3774 Cortland**, 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 old-style windows on the front of the house be replicated and that the applicant will submit a window order or shop drawings for those windows for staff review and approval prior to ordering of the windows.

Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT.

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE
Ayes: 5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: Application HDC2025-00027 (8:30 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 2277 Longfellow
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Boston-Edison
SCOPE OF WORK: Retain aluminum-clad wood windows on façade (work completed without approval)

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
Cody Michael present and sworn in. This house was boarded up before they took the project on in 2021. There wasn't a window or door in the home other than a couple vinyl windows pieced in with block and plywood. Significant investment into it to keep it from falling down. Window order went in within a few days after closing and they thought between-the-glass grilles was acceptable. Since 2021, there was a divorce and this applicant is now responsible for the house. He had installed windows with between-the-glass grilles—the grilles cannot be removed. Pella has confirmed that they cannot replace just the glass and they don't have factory-made grilles to apply to the glass exterior. Custom millwork to apply grilles cost almost more than replacements. Is that estimate available? It's $14,600 from Creative Millwork. Just for the front of the house. That's almost $1200 per window to apply two muntins per window. Commissioner wonders if a local craftsperson could do that work more cost effectively. Why was a permit not pulled? Commissioner states that the design and operation is the same as the historic, color is appropriate, it is an aluminum-clad wood window but its issue is that the muntin is between the glass. The windows on the sides and rear have been approved. The work on the front only is on this application.

ACTION (8:44 p.m.)
Commissioner King moved that:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00027 for 2277 Longfellow**, 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 within this application are located on the front/primary elevation and are highly visible; between-the-glass grilles do not offer a profiled dimensionality which is available with simulated-divided light replacement windows. As stated in the district's *Elements of Design 15) Scale of Facades and Facade Elements* - Window sashes are usually subdivided by muntins, which affect the apparent scale of the windows within the façades.
- Replacement windows for missing or non-historic windows must be compatible with the historic appearance and character of the building.
- The appearance of the replacement windows must be consistent with the general characteristics of a historic window of the type and period.

and therefore, the proposed work fails to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, specifically Standards:

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

and Elements of Design 3 and 15.

Commissioner Marquez: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

Chair encouraged applicant to gather some more data/estimates/information and return to the commission.

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2025-00009 (8:46 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 3470 Cambridge
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Sherwood Forest
APPLICANT/OWNER: Caren Paskel, owner. Mario Dewberry, contractor.
SCOPE OF WORK: Replace steel and wood windows with vinyl-clad wood windows, replace railings and doors (work completed without approval)

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
The owner/applicant and contractor were sworn in. Husband was in charge of construction, then passed in 2020. Ms Paskel thought the only violation was window grids, thought she remedied that issue, put the house on the market, and discovered that there are other violations as well. Need to understand situation for the buyers. Chair asked if homeowner was in contact with the Sherwood Forest homeowner Association. She was not, but was not sure if her husband was. Application appears to be for resubmission of some items previously denied and some new items of work. Contractor confirmed. New

items: removed iron railings at French doors, back removed iron railings, removed juliet balcony, put on large extended second-floor porch, and the three doors on the back. These are new to the commission. Work was done years ago. Window work, rakeboard, soffit, fascia, and painting are all a resubmittal. *Discussion of features and photos.* Rear porch should have been reviewed and approved, but not out of proportion or poorly designed. Front windows appear to be a more noticeable violation for some commissioners. Rear windows were steel casement and windows on side were wood double-hung windows. *Discussion of windows.*

ACTION (8:44 p.m.)
Commissioner Hamilton moved:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00009 for 3470 Cambridge**, 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 steel and wood windows with vinyl-clad wood windows, and covering of wood rake boards, soffits and fascia with aluminum coil, 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:

- Prior to the work within this application being completed, the property retained most of the original materials, physical features, and decorative elements on all four elevations, all of which combined to create its historic character and appearance.

Window Replacement

- The original windows were distinctive character-defining features.
  - The thin frames of steel windows allow for more expansive glass surface, creating a striking visual contrast to the monolithic materiality of masonry-clad walls. The dimensional surface of the steel sash helped emphasize the verticality of the window openings, and in conjunction with the French doors on the front and rear walls, created a consistent rhythm on each side of the dwelling. Additionally, the multi-operational window openings are another distinctive feature and are a design feature found in only a few local historic districts. The steel windows offered a dimensionality and operation that was architecturally appropriate for the age and design of the house.
  - The one-over-one wood double-hung windows within the stucco-clad side gables and wood shake covered rear shed dormer, offered its own uniformity at the third floor.
- The historic windows were replaced with Anderson 400 Series vinyl-clad wood windows, all of different operation and appearance from the original windows.
  - The operation of the windows were changed, obliterating the consistent verticality and rhythm of the window and door openings on the house. The majority of openings now have double-hung one-over-one windows; however, the larger openings on the front, west side, and rear have sliding units. The front sliders have between-the-glass grilles. Sliding windows and between-the-glass grilles are not consistent with the general characteristics of a historic window and do not match the dimensional quality of the removed historic steel window sash.
  - The placement of the new windows doesn't match the more deeply recessed location of the historic windows within the window openings. The depth of plane change between window and wall surfaces is an important feature on the elevations of the house and the current windows don't convey the same visual appearance.

Rake boards, soffit and fascia

- The applicant's photos of the west side gable wall and front entry gable show the profiles of these historic wood rake boards are highly dimensional. The rake board of the largest gable on the façade appears to have been repaired, and the hole in the soffit could be repaired and all the rake board painted. Painted wood surfaces offer a mostly matte finish, in keeping with the matte finish of the

exterior's brick walls.

- Aluminum coil stock can only offer a mostly flat, minimally bent surface and cannot emulate the profile of the wood rake boards. Aluminum also has a sheen which is unlike painted wood; its contrasting surface finish is not compatible with the architectural design and era of the house.
- The Commission regularly does not approve the reinstallation of non-historic materials to cover intact and repairable original features and materials. Therefore, the recently installed aluminum should be removed, and the wood rake boards, fascia and soffits be repaired and painted as needed.

and therefore, 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.

and Elements of Design 7 and 19.

Commissioner Marquez: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00009 for 3470 Cambridge**, 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 King: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2025-00019 (9:17 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 4218 Cortland
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Russell Woods - Sullivan
SCOPE OF WORK: Replace wood windows (work completed without approval) with wood windows, alter stucco and wood trim

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
The owner/applicant, John Nova, is present and is sworn in. Stucco issue. Could they use stucco board and rough sawn instead of a full stucco restoration? Would be a fibercement board designed to look like stucco. Cost saving. Rough sawn covers the joints. Half-timbering appears to be flush with stucco at time of designation. Discussion of bricks at gable—returning to designation photo. Flared-end fascia boards should be restored as well. Vergeboards were not included in app but contractor thought he did include them. Discussion of restored front features and leaving side and rear features. Commissioner would want a drawing of all the front façade details.

ACTION (8:44 p.m.)
Commissioner King moved that:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00019 for 4218 Cortland**, 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 proposed windows on the second floor and attic story, at the front façade, shall be separated by wood mullions, subject to staff review to ensure compatible design.
- The proposed French doors on the first floor, front façade, shall be wood and subject to staff review to ensure compatible design.
- The proposed stucco and half-timbering work shall be made of true stucco or stcco board and shall be detailed to mimic the original design and detail of the original condition and shall be subject to staff review to ensure that historic materials and details are retained when possible and to ensure compatible design.
- The vergeboards will be returned to their former condition with the flared ends.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2025-00020 (9:35 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 4015 Glendale

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Russell Woods - Sullivan
SCOPE OF WORK: Replace steel windows (work completed without approval) with wood windows

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
The applicant, John Nova, is present, along with contractor Jason Floarea. The homeowner is also present, Jequa Halliburton. All were sworn in. Vinyl window installation again. Stop work order. Contractor stated that the steel windows were beyond repair and homeowner did not know that house was in a historic district. Went ahead with vinyl. Proposed now is full-frame wood replacements. Steel to wood—not a one-for-one proposal. Commissioners don't see a proposal that restores missing features. They need those details in order to understand the proposal to approve it.

ACTION (9:47 p.m.)
Commissioner Machielse moved that:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00020 for 4015 Glendale**, 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 historic windows proposed for removal (already removed without approval) are historic and materials and features that contribute to the character of the property that have not been shown to be beyond repair.
- The historic windows proposed for removal (already removed without approval) include highly distinctive, leaded- and stained-glass windows.
- The proposed replacement windows fail to match the old in materials (they are wood rather than steel), design (they are double-hung sash rather than casement), and appearance (they lack the leaded glass subdivisions and stained-glass shield motifs).

and therefore, 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) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
6) Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be documented by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nay: 0
MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2025-00024 (9:50 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 14528 Ashton
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Rosedale Park
SCOPE OF WORK: Replace front porch, alter driveway and walkway

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
The owner/applicant, Josh Maddox, 4545 Architecture, is present and was sworn in. CHN Housing Partners, nonprofit, providing accessibility upgrades using grant funding. Mainly, some hardscape improvements and replacing current wood stair. Architect is concerned that the staff recommends returning to designation photo. The railing shown was removed 10 years ago or more. The staff recommendation is to create a new railing that mimics the historic. Architect is concerned that the railing should be 36" tall because of accessibility concerns. Stone cap is 32" with brick piers below. They agree that the height is a character-defining element and that it being lower than the brick pier and the spacing on the railing are all character-defining features. The architect is concerned that mimicking these details on a tall railing will not work as well because of the stone caps and the proportions will be off. Black metal railing is the primary railing in this neighborhood. For those reasons, they'd like to propose a metal railing. Commissioner asked about a ramp. Architect explained that in this case, the owner does not use a wheelchair but does have some mobility issues and so are trying to reduce some barriers and get a graspable handrail.

ACTION (9:58 p.m.)
Commissioner Marquez moved that:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00024 for 14528 Ashton**, 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 porch's new guardrails (railing which lines the perimeter of the porch deck) shall be wood and match the style of the historic railing that was present at the time of the district's designation. The railing height shall be no higher than the minimum required by the building code (36") because the railing height is a historically significant feature of the house. HDC staff shall be afforded the opportunity to review and approve the new railing design prior to the permit's issuance.

No support. Discussion: Commissioners expressed that they understood the homeowner's situation and thought there might be metal or wood and metal options and maybe a simple booster rail design that could meet the Standards and the homeowner objectives.

Commissioner Machielse moved:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00024 for 14528 Ashton**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application WILL BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS for the proposed work.

Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2025-00025 (10:02 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 23 E. Adams (AKA Central United Methodist Church)
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Grand Circus Park
SCOPE OF WORK: Alter exterior including storefronts, new window openings

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
Commissioner Marquez recuses himself from 23-31 E Adams, HDC2025-00025. Staff report: 31 E Adams is the church house, designed by Smith, Hynchman, and Grylls. Scope is to allow rehabilitation of church house into 39 permanent supportive housing units, staff recommends approval. Most of the work on the historic features is restoration. Staff was not able to approve the replacements of the storefronts along E Adams and at the 4th floor on the rear, application is to replace line of industrial windows with a larger design to allow use of the spaces beyond as housing. Staff does not find these rear windows character defining.

Applicants Jack Schroeder and Sam Comrie.

ACTION (10:09 p.m.)
Commissioner Machielse moved that:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00025 for 23 - 31 E. Adams**, 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:

- Staff is delegated final review authority over the final product, configuration, and design of replacement windows and storefronts

Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: RECUSE

Ayes: 4 Nays: 0 RECUSAL: 1
MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATION/STAFF REPORT NUMBER: HDC2024-00700 (10:11 p.m.)
ADDRESS: 4340 Glendale
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Russell Woods - Sullivan
SCOPE OF WORK: Replace wood windows (work completed without approval) with aluminum-clad wood windows

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
Karina LaVarca and Pella rep Giovanni Baiocco present and sworn in. Homeowner purchased house less than a year ago; most windows were already replaced; they replaced a few more and got cited for a violation. Seeking approval for two front windows, two side windows to left. Wants to sell house and wants to make things right for the next buyer. Staff clarified that staff evaluated proposal for the four windows only—two on front and two on side. Commission cannot discuss other vinyl windows because those windows were denied less than a year ago and so cannot come back yet by commission's rules. Discussed contractor questions. Color is regulated in Detroit; work with staff. Vinyl windows on entire house were denied in July 2024; this application was for four windows. Even if the four windows are approved, the rest of the house windows are still in violation. Homeowners states that entire house's windows would cost $95,000.

ACTION (10:25 p.m.)
Commissioner Marquez moved that:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00700 for 4340 Glendale**, 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 wood windows proposed for removal (already removed without approval) are historic and materials and features that contribute to the character of the property that have not been shown to be deteriorated beyond repair.
- Of the proposed four new windows, two of the units are clearly not appropriate as they do not match the old windows in design (they have muntin patterns, operation, and, consequently, profile, noticeably different than what is known to have historically existed on the property), and the other units are not appropriate as they have a factory mullion, rather than a true mullion.

and therefore, 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.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0
MOTION CARRIED

XIII CITY PROJECTS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

ADDRESS: All
HISTORIC DISTRICT: All
SCOPE OF WORK: Repair/replace sewer laterals in all Local Historic Districts

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
Staff report. City is launching a private sewer repair program for houses affected by June 2021 flooding disaster. 22 neighborhoods currently eligible. None of these actually include houses within local historic districts, but the City wants to expand program into the districts. City seeks a programmatic agreement to allow for timely deployment of the work as long as the work meets pre-established conditions. Work outside those conditions would be reciewed by the commission. Programs' above-grade impact appears to be very limited. Staff concluded impact would be minimal. Ground-disturbing activity would be necessary. Staff concluded that the proposed work would generally be appropriate with some conditions. Not all damaged features would be able to be replaced with in kind/like-for-like replacements. Staff laid out exceptions. Restated that for work outside of staff approval, any work outside staff-approvable scope would have to be to bring item to the commission. Rico Rozzo joined from Home Repair and Neighborhood Services through HRD. Clarified some points. 400 private lateral sewer replacements have been done so far. Goal is 1500. Want to streamline as much as possible with exhaustive guidelines already in place.

ACTION (10:39 p.m.)
Commissioner King moved that:
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00017 for the repair and/or replacement of sewer laterals within historic districts Citywide**, 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:

- An application for any work that has the potential to damage the structural integrity of a building within a local historic district shall be submitted to the Commission for review under its regular process.
- Where disturbance to elements within districts (including sidewalks, streets, shrubs, trees, fences. lawns, curbing, etc.) results from the proposed work, the affected area shall be restored to replicate its pre-construction condition. If replication of the element is not possible, an application for the work shall be submitted to the Commission for review under its regular process.
- Any trees, shrubs, perennials, groundcovers or similar permanent plantings shall be preserved and protected in situ to the extent feasible. The City shall request that the property owner identify such plantings prior to commencement of the work. Any such designated plants heavily damaged or destroyed by the work (either directly or within one calendar year due to excessive disturbance or transplantation) shall be replaced by the City with reasonably similar species/cultivars of similar size, type, quantity and quality, and installed by the City's landscape contractors. Such replantings shall be warranted by the City and its contractor for one (1) additional calendar year.

- Historic built/architectural elements which will be disrupted by the work shall be retained, securely stored and properly reinstalled. If the work will damage such elements or require their removal, an application for the work shall be submitted to the Commission for review under its regular process.
- If the project will damage or require the removal of any historic/significant landscape or hardscape feature, including but not limited to mature specimen trees, an application for the work shall be submitted to the Commission for review under its regular process.
- If the historic status of any element which is required to be removed or subject to damage by the project is in question, HDC staff shall be afforded the opportunity to consult prior to undertaking the work .

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: Abstained
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE
MOTION PASSES 4-0 with ONE ABSTENTION

XIV OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 1710 Bagley
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Corktown
SCOPE OF WORK: Siding (revision to previously approved design)

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
Staff presents report. Discusses one condition of past COA on this property was to remove nonhistoric siding so staff/commission could assess reparability. Commission decided that the front could be covered with LP Siding. Field discovery needs clarification of commission's intent. Discovery: when old siding was removed, original wood siding was still present. Staff found that original siding is salvageable. Front façade had been approved for recovering in LP SmartSide. Side facades as laid out now would have to be restored, but staff seeks commission approval to cover sides in Smartside as well until such time as all sides can be restored. Discussion about potential damage if recovered; why not restore exposed siding? Maybe in future, outline order of operations in motion. No motion made at this meeting.

ADDRESS: 264 Watson (10:56 p.m.)
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Brush Park
SCOPE OF WORK: On reassignment from appeal for hearing of additional evidence

COMMISSION AND APPLICANT DISCUSSION
The owners, Pete Basile and Somers Brush, and architect John Biggar present and sworn in. Came before commission in December with a lot of work and two porch-related items were part of the scope. A porch demolition was denied, applicant appealed, at appeal they produced a report the staff and commission had not yet seen. Judge adjourned case so commission and staff could review the new report. Staff has and recommends that the commission uphold their original decision. *Discussion.* Law asks Mr. Biggar to confirm that the date of the letter should have been 2025; he confirmed. Commissioner believes the information provided does not change the commission's decision and that the Commission should reaffirm their original decision. Law gave guidance.

ACTION (8:44 p.m.)
Commissioner Hamilton moved that:
Having duly reviewed the additional information submitted for **Application HDC2024-00066 for 264 Watson,** and having duly considered the additional information relative to the proposed work, the Commission reaffirms its decision to deny that application.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Commissioner Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: NAY
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: NAY

Ayes: 3 Nays: 2
MOTION CARRIED

XV NEW BUSINESS

The question is when the Commission reviews and approves large development projects with more than one building, and the Commission sees the project as one project. Sometimes staff receives permit applications from BSEED in piecemeal fashion. Sometimes staff requests that the project come in instead all at once, but not always. How does the Commission want staff to handle such a situation? Especially when phases were not approved, or the phases change. Commission would like application brought back if approved phases change.

XVI ADJOURNMENT

ACTION (11:25 p.m.)
Commissioner Machielse moved to adjourn.

Commissioner King: SUPPORT

Commissioners voice voted.

MOTION CARRIED

Chairperson Franklin adjourned the meeting at 11:25 p.m.