

MINUTES**DETROIT HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING**

July 2, 2025

*Coleman A. Young Municipal Center, Suite 808***I CALL TO ORDER**

Vice Chair Machielse called the meeting to order at 4:43 p.m.

II ROLL CALL

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION		PRESENT	ABSENT
Tiffany Franklin	Chair	X—arrived at 4:44 PM	
James Hamilton	Commissioner	X	
Marcus King	Commissioner	X	
Alan Machielse	Vice Chair	X	
William Marquez	Commissioner		X
Adrea Simmons	Commissioner	X	
Katy Trudeau	Commissioner	X	
STAFF			
Alexa Bush (Department Director)	PDD	X	
Audra Dye	PDD	X	
Garrick Landsberg (Director)	PDD	X	
Jennifer Ross	PDD		X
Bilqees Salie	PDD		X
Lise St James	PDD	X	
Ellen Thackery	PDD	X	

III APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**ACTION**Commissioner Hamilton moved that the agenda be approved.Commissioner King: SUPPORTCommissioner Franklin: AYECommissioner Hamilton: AYECommissioner King: AYECommissioner Machielse: AYECommissioner Simmons: AYECommissioner Trudeau: AYE

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED**IV APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

None

V REPORTS

- Director Landsberg and Acting Chair Machielse welcomed newest commissioner Katy Trudeau.

VI APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO CONSENT AGENDA

None

VII POSTPONED APPLICATIONS

None

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

None

IX APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

1395 Antietam, 1 Lafayette Plaisance, 1301 Nicolet Place, 1300 Nicolet Place, 1301 Joliet Place, 1300 Joliet Place, and adjacent Rights-of-Way - Lafayette Park/ Mies van der Rohe HD – Excavate for existing steam pipe slip-lining and new steam pipe installation, install construction fencing/tree protection, restore concrete curbs/ landscape pavement, install permanent steam stacks

- A. Staff report presented by Alexa Bush
- B. Harvey Hollins, David Scherer, Mark Hansen, present and sworn in. Presented revised plan.
- C. Chair Frankin establishes the protocol for the public comments portion of the meeting. She acknowledged that public comments that were received were uploaded to the webpage for this meeting.
- D. Chair opened public comments, beginning with online participants, 5:34 pm.
- E. PUBLIC COMMENTS—*Summarized below—not transcribed.*
 1. Liz Boone, resident of Lafayette Park, asked who will enforce these plans? What is the mitigation plan? Who will be responsible if something bad happens?
 2. Ryan Robertson, resident of 1300 and former member of finance committee, engage Kofi Boone, landscape architect, together reviewed plans and he assured board that the plan is quite a good one and that some regeneration is a good thing.
 3. James Perkinson, resident, was present at May 14 meeting, had shared concerns, but has not had time to review the plans presented tonight. Had thought there would be bi-weekly meetings and opportunities to engage but none of that has happened. He discourages the commission to make any decisions until the co-ops get due process.
 4. Laura Lewis, resident, encouraged the commission to reject the Detroit Thermal narrative that the neighbors are at war. Detroit Thermal is an international private equity-owned entity. Commission needs accurate and complete information from Detroit Thermal.
 5. Andrew Kem, resident of Nicolet Place, concerned about safety tradeoff without steam stacks, questioned the applicants' characterization that the pile of dirt and busted-up snow fencing is a result of the stop work order—these conditions have existed for months. Subcontractors are not professionals, not people we can trust with our historic neighborhood.
 6. iPhone 3, Eleanor Johnson in 1300, stated that some kind of infrastructure is needed, motors are running and expensive, and the dirt and dust is problematic. They need better air quality and heat and air.

7. Seth Saeugling, resident, stated that Detroit Thermal has been a bad actor and has not engaged with residents. Private entity seeking to dig up private land. Encourages commission to vote no.
8. Maria Hubbard, a member of the 1300 building, requested commission's support of Detroit Thermal's plan, their lines have probably been here longer than the buildings have. Hopes we can find a solution that works to get residents heat.
9. Claire, lives in 1404 Nicolet co-op, encouraging commission to vote no. Encouraged commission to require Detroit Thermal to earnestly and actively engage with residents.
10. Jessica's iphone, Jessica Prost, LaSalle Co-op, has been saddened by Detroit Thermal's narrative that we have been preventing our neighbors from having heat when Detroit Thermal have not been professional and have other routes to take to get heat to our neighbors but haven't done it.
11. Debra Henning, thinks this is being decided as an economic decision when it seems the DDA should be dealing with economic issues and the historic district commission should be dealing with the historic issues.
[5:59 pm: Virtual comments period is closed.]
12. Arlene Frank, 39-year resident of Nicolet Townhouses and current president of the Niolet Co-op Association, has been waiting for an engagement process, has asked for a delay so that engagement process could happen. They worked with Kay Sicheneder as a landscape architect and her report has been included and distributed. They also worked with Cassandra Talley, architectural historian, to review the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and this plan.
13. Michael Pinsky, VP of Lafayette Coop, board of directors of Lafayette, LaSalle, Joliet, and Nicolet Coops, oppose this project because of its historic impacts. Preserving historic integrity is crucial. Detrimental to these homeowners.
14. Eric Kessell, president of LaSalle Cooperative, much of the work planned is on priovate property without consent, the new revisions to be on the right-of-ways are new, inaccurate, and outdated. There are many errors. No inventory of landscape elements and mature landscape elements is provided. Trees and shrubs will be damaged, and the plan misrepresents the impact.
15. Sammy Sader, president of Joliet Co-op, the work proposed is not historically appropriate and does not follow Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines. The proposed work does not protect historic resources, harms the landscape, and does not benefit the historic site. A certificate of appropriateness should be denied.
16. Leslie Lott, resident, requests the HDC give their arborist Kay Sicheneder, 15 minutes to respond to point out factual inaccuracies from Detroit Thermal's presentation.
17. Kay Sicheneder, consulting arborist, not a resident. She believes the Detroit Thermal plan is incomplete and incorrect and does not follow national arborist standards. Tree roots are not adequately protected. Trees will suffer and decline, trees can fail and fail. Their plan is not adequate for protecting the trees. Trees need both health and structural integrity. It can take three years for trees to fail, so three years of post-construction monitoring is recommended. Also, a qualified arborist is recommended to be on site during construction period. Root pruning must be done judiciously and a certified arborist or a consulting arborist should be on site to supervise that work.
18. Amy Turner, President of 1300 E Lafayette Co-Operative, some residents are here, they need heat. Detroit Thermal has addressed concerns. Their board's landscape architect agrees with the findings that some regeneration would be beneficial. Where we see buildings and trees, there was once a streetgrid with underground utilities, including steam energy. 65 years later, we still need access to the underground pipes that Mies and Birketts designed to top with buildings and landscape. Easements exist to allow access to these underground systems. Part of urban life is disruption in our yards for our neighbors.

Appealed to commissioners for urgency because winter is 5 months away and these delays have greatly impacted the residents of 1300.

19. Sarah Hayache, Joliet Cooperative, consulting arborists like Kay Sicheneder, are more qualified and trained as compared to qualified arborists. Note that Detroit Thermal did not consult with an arborist until they were forced to. Detroit Thermal's survey is riddled with errors, some very big and misleading. Many more trees than acknowledged will be in the zone of impact. Detroit Thermal is not following its own guidelines—they say they will protect a tree with fencing out to the dripline but then they don't.
20. Ari Ruttenberg, senior policy analyst with the office of Council President Mary Sheffield. Read letter into record. She worked with her community and Detroit Thermal. Seeks to protect and honor all the residents in the Lafayette Park area. Community wants to work together. Thanked commission and staff for undertaking this effort to engage with Detroit Thermal and residents and hopes for a resolution that leaves all parties involved better off.
21. Erin, resident of Joliet Co-op, this community was designed for families and their safety. The site has not been safe since construction began last year and is afraid for her kids' safety especially with steam. Read from arborist's report. Detroit Thermal's June 11, 2025 is neither comprehensive nor complete. It lacks adequate tree protection. Recommended a plan for mitigation and protection.
22. Lindsay Flynn, resident at 1350 Joliet Place, Is this plan historically correct/appropriate? Continued to read from arborist's report. Plan site maps and tree assessments: Detroit Thermal counted four plants impacted by the proposed work. Kay Sicheneder identified 50-51 trees that will be impacted. Found at least 23 trees that would suffer from some level of injury during construction.
23. Miniou, resident at Joliet Co-op, continued reading from their arborist's report. 11 of these 23 trees have potential for severe impact that would likely result in their removal. Arborist expects four trees to experience severe impacts from the excavation.
24. Sally, Joliet Co-op, continued to read from arborist's report. In Zone 1, there are 9 trees of concern; 6 trees are expected to suffer severe construction injury.
25. Utica Jackal, LaSalle Co-op, In Zone 3, 4 large noteworthy trees will be negatively impacted by the compaction on the access route on the lawn. In Zone 4, 4 trees will be negatively impacted. In addition, construction activities will trigger removal of mature shrubs and plants. Detroit Thermal's plans replace these with much smaller plants. A complete inventory of impacted plants has not been performed.
26. Andrew Johnson, resident of La Salle coop, there are many errors in the Detroit Thermal survey. Incorrect diameter measurements or mislabeling of tree species. The HDC requested that Detroit Thermal provide more information about how Detroit Thermal would protect the landscape since the landscape is important to the community's National Historic Landmark status. Reviewed these 9 questions and Detroit Thermal's responses. (1) Finer detail needed but not accurately provided. (2) Plan does not have adequate soil protection—need plywood.
27. Nancy, LaSalle Co-Op, continued to read from report. Arborist is needed on site for root pruning.
28. Carol LaSalle Co-op, thanked commission, final recommendations: page 8, ask that the commission include these in their decision: Prior to construction, (1) Detroit Thermal must redo construction plan to show all the trees in the construction zone, correctly labeled and sized, (2) Detroit Thermal must add critical root zones 1' for 1" diameter, and structural root zones .5 foot per 1" diameter to the plan, (3) Detroit Thermal must perform tree impact assessment for trees to be root pruned, compared pruning plan to trees' critical and structural root zones, (4) a preconstruction meeting should be held to discuss tree protection measures, sediment and material storage locations, access routes, and fencing locations. (5) During all phases of construction, an experienced arborist should oversee all operations

- in critical root zones, (6) a certified arborist should monitor tree protection measures and tree condition daily during construction, (7) a plan should be implemented for supplemental watering
29. Randy Essex, resident of Nicolet Co-Op, two points: past performance is best indicator of future behavior and these crews have badly damaged a tree, a bench, and left a pile of dirt for months. A community benefit plan might help, but without that, Detroit Thermal should pay into a fund to mitigate damage that becomes apparent later. (2) Object to characterization that we want to deprive neighbors of heat—we want Detroit Thermal to find another path.
 30. Angela Frankenburg, resident Nicolet Co-Op, Detroit Thermal wants to shortcut through these private properties to increase their profits instead of taking another path.
 31. Don Kinzano, La Salle Co-op, have lived in this National Historic Landmark for 40 years. Visit it—it is unique and magnificent. The Commission asked Detroit Thermal to answer but they have not: what is the impact of steam on the landscape? What are the long-term impacts of having steam pipes underground on the roots of trees? Detroit Thermal went to MPSC and signed a contract before knowing the historic requirements.
 32. Isaac Gurley, 12 years old, resident of La Salle Co-Op in Lafayette Park, loves living here, he thinks the beauty and historic nature of where he lives is special. Hopes a different route can be found to get his neighbors heat.
 33. Roberta Derry, reading Cassandra Talley's remarks (architectural historian). Detroit HDC can request any information necessary to complete this application. Unclear that Detroit Thermal can do this work on private property. The inventory is inaccurate and incomplete, and proposal does not meet Secretary of Interior's Standards. The HDC can request additional documentation and should request archeological research is conducted. Detrimental work to an NHL. Work proposed here is not benefiting the historic resource. A Certificate of Appropriateness is not appropriate in this situation.
 34. Rob Free, retired environmental consultant and Joliet resident. Detroit Thermal has failed to provide alternate steam routes on available public property (connecting to existing steam service within the utility easements would be less damaging than this proposal), and Detroit Thermal has not completed the required commission application. Much information is left out from this application, and drawings are unclear and are not signed and sealed. The proposed work should not be allowed until necessary permits have been acquired. Approval would be detrimental and precedent setting.
 35. Benjamin Moulter, resident of La Salle Co-Op, neighborhood is unique. Its preservation is essential and this project threatens the current and future nature of this area. There are alternate paths and no easements on this private property. Establishment of the steam easement could be detrimental and could create a precedent. Alternatives should be explored.
 36. Rebecca Chung, community volunteer, Lafayette Park neighborhood association and is active on the 375 reconstruction project, and is a book and literary historian. Lafayette Park is a high intrinsic-value object. It is as rare and important as anything in a museum. An object of high intrinsic value improves everything around it. The entire neighborhood would be impacted by the damage here.
 37. Neil Mceachren, 1342 Nicolet, the Dr. Charles H. Wright House. The CAYMC features a display of preserved places. The text about Lafayette Park mentions the site's manicured landscapes and mature trees and winding paths. Help us to preserve our landscape.
 38. Meredith, resident of Joliet Co-Op, has four things for commission's consideration. (1) the commission's own application requires the homeowner's participation and permission, but we don't have that here. (2) Residents were promised robust community engagement by Detroit Thermal but we didn't get that. (3) We are all stewards of this place, and this is not our problem to solve. 1300 contracted with Detroit Thermal under Detroit Thermal's faulty

assumptions that they'd be able to cut through private property and a National Historic Landmark.

39. Marquita Johnson, resident of Joliet Co-op, inherited her unit from her mother and grew up there. It is truly a remarkable landscape and it will not look as it did before the work. Bring Detroit Thermal back to the table with neighbors, maybe find another plan, make sure proper protocols are followed. Many years have been invested in taking care of the landscape. The people doing the proposed work will not care. Ask them to return to the table.
40. Christian Unverzagt, lived here since 2003. If it's not drawn, it's not built. Architecture students have to present their drawings. There is value in drawings and words about the drawings. Does this application meet the guidelines set by the historic district commission?
41. James Grifune. Last time, you asked Detroit Thermal to do better. Tonight, they have proposed a sloppy and vague plan, and yet they are confident that their vague proposal will be enough. The City and Director Bush want this project and hope you will rubber stamp it. Mentions his FOIA request. He hopes the commission will base their decision on the application alone and will deny.
42. Chair Franklin interrupted public comment to say that she and her fellow commissioners operate with integrity and that Director Bush has never contacted her and that would be highly inappropriate. She said that staff or the City have never pressured her. They strictly use the Rehab standards and the Elements of Design.
43. Sarah Woodward, your responsibility is to ensure that the application before you satisfies the Standards set by the Department of the Interior. It clearly does not. Every month, you give up your time and you hold property owners to the Standards. If you don't, who will? You do it because protecting our historic neighborhoods is important. Treat these applicants like any other.
44. Carol Columbo Mastie, 1300 resident. What I'm hearing is that our neighbors value trees more than heat. An easement is meant for access. It is disheartening to hear people talk about trees when our residents need heat and better air.
45. Cynthia Pachicora, Lafayette Park resident, urges implications of approval. The place fosters community and neighborliness. The whole landscape is the glue of the design. The design is a masterpiece and has been recognized as such and is very influential, but it's not important just because of its past—it has been a stable setting for Detroit city living for 60 years. The National Park Service warned that this project would negatively impact this National Historic Landmark. Approving this plan means allowing adverse effects to the important landmark. Please respect our local and federal designation.
46. Dorothy Pelt, thanks to commissioners. Has lived in 1300 for 40 years. Has many experiences in the neighborhood, values the amenities here, and her children and grandchildren have always appreciated the area and having friends from all across the community.
47. Patricia Janes has lived in 1300 for 11 years, and Dottie has been one of her best neighbors. Now, today, it pains her to see how these neighborhood relationships have been damaged. The experts have presented a plan to benefit us all. The past owners of Black Bottoms properties had their neighborhood bulldozed for our community. We all need each other—we need good neighbors.
48. Robin Janes, 11-year resident 1300 Lafayette. (1) 1300 Lafayette was built with steam as its way to power the building. Steam has been used throughout Detroit for many years. It is economical and is not new, and is sustainable. (2) Lives on the 25th floor. When he looks down on Mies van der Rohe, the plant canopy is very lush. This project would only take a small sliver. And economics are important to this case. Of our 330 units, 200 are studios or 1-bedrooms—people are on fixed incomes. We need a good, sound heating system. We want an economical solution, and plants will regenerate. People cannot.

49. Ed Grooten, 1300 Lafayette, have been through a lot of planning rounds. Residents see benefits—economical and environmentally sound. For 62 years, that steam pipe was running. Steam pipe will continue to do ok. The plan of this piping run out past the school, we don't have money for that extension—that's why you have the plan before you that you do.
50. Lisa Mara, her family has been residents since the 1980s. They weren't hoodwinked—our board did a lot of due diligence. There was a June 24 meeting but no one came. Even if we took a longer way around, we'd still have an impact. These residents love the landscape too.
51. Clark Campbell, Detroit Thermal has been finagling this project. They came up with this alternate plan, one that moved the push pit down to Joliet. They hedged this option last time and now need to exercise that. There is another viable option—please deny this petitioner's request.
52. Alan Schenk—lived in 1300 before, and then lived in a Mies townhouse since 1966. In this unusual case, these contractors will not have accountability to the property owners.
53. Sally Beard, grounds chair at Joliet, cannot believe the man from the Flint water crisis is pitching this project. They have not cleaned up what they said they would. Residents have been dealing with what they left behind since last year. The City should help the residents find a better solution.
54. Paul Saginaw, shareholder at 1300. Three points: scope of digging is small, Detroit Thermal has committed to responsibly restoring or replacing any disturbed greenery, respectfully asks commissioners to preserve the historic character of the property that won't be disturbed, and based on the facts and not emotional arguments.
55. Natalie Pruitt, board member of the Nicolet Townhouse Co-operative in the Lafayette Park National Historic Landmark. This project is not historically appropriate. That's the conclusion provided by technical experts in their reports shared. Referred to letter provided, (1) much of the work is planned in private property, not right of way (2) the Detroit Thermal plan is inaccurate, (3) the historic landscape will be damaged (4) the work is not historically appropriate and doesn't meet the Standards, (5) turns the Standards are not their head to approve detrimental work inside a National Historic Landmark and does not provide any benefits to it. This is not a rehabilitation or a preservation project. We have an industrial project that will only harm the historic resources.
56. Angela Fertino, LaSalle Co-Op, Applicant failed to point out an existing steam pipe. It is not shown in the project zone, no survey is included, no proper easement documentation is shown, no professional engineering stamps are included. This application is not complete or ready for approval. Manhole covers are not present. They stated that they don't know if the plan to push the pipe from Lafayette to Joliet will work—if they have to dig a new trench, many of us will not be able to get into our homes. Incomplete plans mean an increased risk of unforeseen conditions at the cost of 1300, the historic district, and the landmark the commission protects. Profit over place and people should not prevail.
57. Emily Palatius, attorney representing the Nicolet, Joliet, and LaSalle Co-Ops. You've heard compelling testimony as to why Detroit Thermal's request should be denied or postponed for more study. Can Detroit Thermal do work without the consent of the landowners? That is still a live question and is to be addressed in court. If action will happen, it should be a denial to allow the State Historic Preservation Board to consider the matter.
58. Cynthia Ross, attorney and resident at 1300. The pipes that we are seeking to install would go over existing pipes; it won't be a new path. We feel that is the most cooperative way. Also, there have been a lot of modifications—Detroit Thermal has employed an arborist and plans to restore the park after the installation. There were meetings with others besides just 1300 but no one came, and that lack of interest should be noted here. Detroit Thermal

went to the public service commission as a utility as any entity would do, so it is an inaccurate representation to suggest they were not acting appropriately. Urges commission to approve the application.

[Chair closed public comment regarding this application at 7:38. 5-minute break.]

X CITY PROJECTS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

None

XI PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. Sarah Hayash asked if there has ever been an instance where an application was ever submitted to the commission without a property owner's consent
- B. Resident asked about the state of completeness of an application. The application he sees online has none of the forms that would be required to make this application complete.

[Chair closes public comment]

- C. Chair asks staff for comment. Staff determines that an application is provisionally complete. Commission will recall that at a past regular meeting, this application had been put before you by staff who had found it provisionally complete, but the commission, after much discussion, had found it incomplete. The determination of an application's completeness is determined by the commission. The decision about completeness on this particular application has not yet been made.

[Commission discussion, summarized]

Chair called back to the podium the Detroit Thermal team and reminded them they are still under oath.

Chair asked them to restate their credentials. David Scherer stated he is ISA-certified arborist for 10 years, has been in industry for 22 years. Chair reads that an ISA-certified arborist has a demonstrated basic knowledge to inspect trees and perform tree care, has required state-arborist-statute-designations or licenses, has demonstrated basic knowledge to perform tree care with required minimum qualifications individual and/or business to meet statute requirements for the specific jurisdiction. Mr. Scherer stated that his 22 years of experience in the field probably has more weight than his ISA certification. Confirmed he is licensed.

Commissioner Hamilton: Some public comments stated that what is before us is to determine whether this proposed work would be historically appropriate or not. That's right. Does the proposed work meet the Standards? In response to our May questions, you have made more specific what the impact of the work would be. What we heard today is that another arborist had a different perspective and that the plan you presented today they found to be incomplete or inaccurate/ included everything that is relevant regarding what your work will affect. If you've had a chance to look at their report, how does that analysis relate to your analysis? The landscape here is of huge significance, but is a small piece of land.

Mark Hansen, Giffels Webster, submitted plan. Small area, mainly plants will be affected. The difference between us and the external arborist is probably a more subjective study. Pushing pipe through existing pipe, so minimal impact or none as far as heat/steam. He has been a landscape architect for 35 years, stands by this plan, Giffels Webster works in Detroit often.

Commissioner Trudeau: Why were you able to remove the steam stacks and how are you safely venting heat safely and appropriately through manhole covers instead of the steam stacks?

Detroit Thermal called up Richard Pucak, General Manager of Detroit Thermal, and he got sworn in. He explained that the reason you'd have vapor at the manhole level is either that you have water intrusion or a steam leak. Drains are there to take that water away, and Detroit Thermal redid those drains. Because this is brand new piping and so the likelihood of steam escape is minimal, and because they fixed the drains in the manholes so any water intrusion you could get would drain off, they are able to eliminate the stacks. Commissioner Trudeau stated that she was not at the last meeting, but her understanding is that the stacks that had been proposed would not be historically appropriate for the neighborhood. This application does not include steam stacks. Is it possible steam stacks may be needed? Mr. Pucak stated that they believe the cast iron castings are safe—they are throughout the city. The vents provide extra protection. Here, the residents did not want them. Chair asks, whether residents want them or not, did you do a proper assessment as to whether they're needed? Laypeople may not know what is required, and we trust experts with that knowledge to keep people safe. Detroit Thermal stated that both manhole covers and stacks do the same thing—they emit steam in the case of a steam event. Commissioner King sought confirmation that safety would not be compromised if a manhole cover is chosen over a stack. Detroit Thermal confirmed. The new fibertight lids have become available in the last 5-7 years and the industry is switching to those when it makes sense. Commissioner Simmons asked whether the areas where the new technology is being used, are the areas residential? They're around the hospital, around the stadiums, residential high-rises—they don't have much in residential areas. Commissioner Trudeau mentioned she remains concerned that in the future, stacks might be needed and is concerned about their appropriateness for the historic district. Chair stated that any changes that are required later will be required to come back to the commission for approval.

Commissioner King asked Detroit Thermal to walk him through a typical workday regarding this area outside the Co-Op that is the staging area—is that staging area where equipment will be stored on a daily basis? Commissioner Machielse also wanted to understand what the movement through that area would be—an excavator or a backhoe—how often is it driving over this area and these roots? Mr. Scherer stated that they'll put boards over tree roots, and will do a deep root feeding process this year and next year. That underground feeding will break up compaction. Mr. Scherer will be on site any time that any root pruning or tree work will be done and will be on site when protective fencing is going up. Chair asked him to describe what signs a tree will exhibit when it is stressed and how long it may take for a tree to exhibit those symptoms; he addressed; could take 5 years.

Commissioner Simmons asked what safeguards Detroit Thermal has put into place to ensure that the best practices and best monitoring practices for years after the work will be followed? What enforcement mechanisms will there be? The landscape architect stated that the landscape plan is guaranteed for two years. Chair stated that two years may not be enough time to assess the health of trees that have been uprooted or damaged. Commissioner Machielse stated that he'd likely expect to see a period of three to five years of monitoring if the commission were to approve this plan of work.

Director Bush offered a clarification to rectify differences between the application and the staff report on page 6. Public comment, a report submitted on behalf of the co-ops, the second-to-last comment; staff looked at the National Park Service guidelines around the historically appropriate protection of trees in a historic landscape; they align almost entirely with the recommendation from the Co-Op's arborist and with Detroit Thermal's plan to use ¾" plywood on a bed of mulch to protect the tree roots.

Chair seeks confirmation that Detroit Thermal will stay on and monitor the trees' health for at least three years. Mr. Scherer agreed that would be fair. Chair asked whether the Detroit Thermal team has effectively identified all trees that will be impacted by your project? Have they all been identified by

species and numbered? How many of the affected trees are the original historic trees? Landscape architect wasn't sure. In the staff report, there is an identification of tree impacts as part of the analysis of historic sensitivity. As part of that, elements that are features in this landscape have been identified. Commissioner Machielse points out that the plants that are outside the period of significance have been identified in the staff report as well.

Commissioner Trudeau asked if Detroit Thermal can address the other arborist's contention that some tree species were misidentified? Arborist can't do it here on the spot because they're not clear but commissioners indicate it would have to be done. Some conditions would have to be specified that require Detroit Thermal to verify that what is on the plans is actually there. Commissioner King asked about when trees and shrubs are identified as "invasive", what will they be replaced with. The landscape architect said that their plan is to replace with "historic appropriate."

Commissioner Trudeau asked about the team's experience with highly sensitive historic landscapes. Landscape architect stated that preserving historic elements is part of what they do.

Commissioner Machielse asked about root pruning of the honey locust and that this root pruning would happen within the critical root zone. Mr. Scherer stated that roots will grow back and they grow back stronger. This proposed cut is on one side of the tree and he is not concerned that it will damage the structural integrity of the tree. Chair asked about seasonal appropriateness for pruning. Arborist said late summer is a good time to prune roots because they regenerate in the fall and winter. Chair asked about for trees that will be removed—how will they be dug up, stored, and preserved? It's stored nearby and kept watered and then it will be put back. Any trees they affect they will deep root feed. Commissioner asked about time period they will be in this area—team answered that they'll be in this historic area 8 weeks. Lafayette will take longer but this phase will be 8 weeks.

Chair stated that although this board does not have enforcement power to force contractors to meet with the public that will be affected by their work, she does encourage public engagement. She encourages open dialogue and meetings out of respect and politeness, even though the commission cannot enforce that engagement.

Commissioner Hamilton asked Director Bush if she had a chance to review the Co-Op's arborist's recommendations. She received them today and went through them on record, and noted that some of the items the commission has discussed already, like how to protect roots with plywood. Chair expressed appreciation for staff's extensive report and willingness to look at these materials as well. Commissioner Hamilton asked whether her staff recommendations would change after looking at the Co-Op's arborist's report. Director Bush stated that she thinks that a lot of the recommendations in the Co-Op's arborist's (Sicheneder's) report are broadly consistent to what is in the staff report—tying back branches instead of trimming them, making sure turf grass is a specification fit, the window on mitigation/timeframe of impact might be a condition the commission would consider; the overall integrity is more than singular plants. Chair asked Detroit Thermal about how long they would imagine monitoring going forward. They stated that if the commission thinks three years for monitoring is appropriate, Detroit Thermal can adjust to three years.

Commissioner King asked about two layers of root protection that Ms Sicheneder's report/letter suggested. Detroit Thermal's arborist stated that he doesn't think dual protection is necessary. He doesn't think the equipment to be used here is enough to require extra protections. Commissioner Machielse asked again about frequency. How often will the 9000-pound excavator drive over these roots? Detroit Thermal explained that they'll be using a mini-excavator and a backhoe, so 2000 or 3000 pounds at a time. They will be moving the equipment from one place (staging) to the other (excavation) every day. Director Bush offered that there could be additional clarity in what's shown in the construction access

path vs. what's shown inside the construction area—codifying that as a condition that tree protection would be in all areas of work, even within the zone. That may not be described in as much detail as desired in the drawings as submitted.

Commissioner Trudeau asked about procedure—some of the questions and answers are more general as opposed to more specific and so how does the commission proceed? Chair answers that the commission keeps asking questions seeking information and details until a motion is made. Director Bush reminded the commission that as this is a very important cultural landscape as well, the guidelines for cultural landscapes are referenced in Preservation Brief 36; preserving cultural landscapes is different from preserving a building's historic material, since landscapes evolve because they are living materials.

ACTION

MOTION:

Commissioner King moved: Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00243** for 1395 Antietam, 1 Lafayette Plaisance, 1301 Nicolet Place, 1300 Nicolet Place, 1301 Joliet Place, 1300 Joliet Place, and adjacent rights-of-way, 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 agrees to pull and tie back limbs that may impede the construction zones rather than removes limbs of mature branches of all trees affected
- Ensures hydroseed grass species matches existing turf grass in all areas of disturbance
- A three-year minimum monitoring period for all repatriated trees be instituted
- If that tree should fail to take root then the applicant will replace that tree in kind.
- The applicant shall provide a reconciled and comprehensive tree survey to HDC staff before beginning work.

Discussion: Commissioner Machielse stated that he thinks three years is not enough because with root pruning, it could take longer than three years for impact to become evident. He would be more comfortable with 4 or 5 years of monitoring. Also, he's not only concerned about the hawthorn that will be picked up and replanted. He's concerned about all the other trees and roots that will be impacted. He also stated he was concerned that if no standard minimum caliper size is noted in the condition, a 24-inch diameter tree could get replaced with a one-inch tree. He doesn't think that's acceptable.

Commission discussed a plan for monitoring in an ongoing way and reporting to the HDC staff.

Director Bush offered that ideally, with a landscape of this character and magnitude, a cultural landscape preservation plan would exist. A document like that can inform the restoration of features, whether they're impacted by a project, a storm, or reaching the end of their life, because this is a living landscape, a document like that can inform. Director Bush suggested that instead of a specific caliper size, the condition could be that all trees are replaced in accordance with the guidelines. A preservation plan for this landscape could be another tool in the ongoing stewardship of this landscape through time and could be a future benefit to its ongoing health and integrity.

Commissioner Trudeau suggested that another condition could be that the applicant redo the construction plan after reviewing the alternate arborist's plan to ensure that there is consistency between those two reports to the types of trees and historic nature of the trees. Chair suggested that there be a report upon project completion of every tree's condition. Commissioner Simmons suggested there be a pre- and post-condition assessment, and that their pre-work report be corrected to be free of inaccuracies, especially about tree species. The pre-work plan updated to be accurate, and then the recommendations being reconciled with some of the other arborist's recommendations. And then a post-work plan showing the state of the project after the work. The commission discussed dual protection for the roots. Director Bush read from the National Parks Service guidance on avoiding soil compaction. Commission discussed potential motion and conditions further.

ACTION

MOTION:

Commissioner King moved: Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00243** for 1395 Antietam, 1 Lafayette Plaisance, 1301 Nicolet Place, 1300 Nicolet Place, 1301 Joliet Place, 1300 Joliet Place, and adjacent rights-of-way, 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:

1. The applicant will pull and tie back limbs that may impede the construction zones rather than remove limbs on all trees affected.
2. Ensures hydroseed grass species matches existing turf grass in all areas of disturbance.
3. A 4-year monitoring plan for the trees, including an on-site arborist during tree protection, uprooting, transporting, tree pruning, and replanting. Should a tree die, the applicant shall come back to the Commission for approval of a suitable replacement tree.
4. The applicant shall prepare a comprehensive tree survey that is reconciled with the tree survey presented by the residents.
5. The applicant shall also prepare an historic landscape plan that identifies all trees
6. At the completion of work, the applicant shall also submit to the Commission a planned assessment of trees after the work is completed.
7. The applicant shall submit to HDC staff the permitted drawings required to complete the work.
8. The applicant shall utilize tree protection akin to a 3/4" plywood atop a 6-inch layer of mulch per the National Park Service recommendations.

Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Frankin: AYE
 Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
 Commissioner King: AYE
 Commissioner Machielse: AYE
 Commissioner Simmons: AYE
 Commissioner Trudeau: AYE

MOTION PASSED, 6-0

XII APPLICATIONS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

None

XIII CITY PROJECTS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

None

XIV OLD BUSINESS

None

XV NEW BUSINESS

None

XVI ADJOURNMENT

ACTION (9:30 p.m.)

Commissioner Machielse moved to adjourn.

Commissioner Simmons: SUPPORT

MOTION CARRIED

Chairperson Franklin adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.