

MINUTES**DRAFT****DETROIT HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**

July 9, 2025

*Coleman A. Young Municipal Center, Erma Henderson Auditorium***I CALL TO ORDER****Vice Chair Machielse called the meeting to order at 4:50 p.m.****II ROLL CALL** (4:50 p.m.)

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION		PRESENT	ABSENT
Tiffany Franklin	Chair	X (delayed)	
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 (delayed)	
STAFF			
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 Hamilton: AYECommissioner King: AYECommissioner Machielse: AYECommissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 4 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED**IV APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

No minutes available

V REPORTS

None

VI APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO CONSENT AGENDA

None

VII POSTPONED APPLICATIONS

None

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

301-321 Edmund Place—erect a multi-family building

Applicants attending online, all sworn in:
Zain Mikho, Managing Principal, Woodward Capital Partners
Michael Poris, McIntosh-Poris
Reid Mauti, McIntosh-Poris
JP Mansolf, HRD
Dominique Boyer, HRD

[Powerpoint Presentation] Chair invited applicant to give a report. Mr. Poris presented. He stated that HDC staff has seen this proposal before, but Commission has not. Firm has been working on this building a while now. They have reduced the scale of the building. 4 stories, corner being retail, ground-floor units next to retail are ground-floor units similar to townhouses with garden in front. Parking is surface level. Small dog run. Lobby is at SW corner. Small retail at SE corner. Gates on alley, trash from alley. Building is 4 stories. Similar scale to neighbors, not overpowering. Some nearby buildings are taller at 5-6 stories. Brick, so fits in. Seeks to be compatible but not trying to mimic historic. It steps back along Brush, bays each step back, breaking up scale. Similar to a warehouse building. There is some depth to the brick. Introduced a faux wooden panel in the window plane also breaking down window scale. Brick blend light to dark, cast stone at base. Window mullions are a deep terra cotta red. A little landscaping out front references other developments in the historic district and buffers units from sidewalk.

Chair explains that the Commission's role is to determine whether this project will have a demonstrable effect on the district, and whether the Commission wants to take a stance on proposal.

Commissioner question: how will trash be handled. There is a trash room off alley. Trash will be stored there and then the trash will be rolled out. Parking ratio? 50%, meeting form-based code. Also, in discussions with nearby parking structures—the team will be talking with other parking providers as well.

Commissioner states that he thinks this is good, respectful infill. Wonders if residential ground floor units should be differentiated more. He is not trying to design—thinking about weather and units.

Signage will have its own review.

Commissioner believes this proposed building is respectful to nearby historic buildings. It is not going to detract from the historic building next door. Thinks it will have a positive impact on neighborhood.

ACTION

Commissioner Hamilton moved that the Commission find that the proposed project at 301-321 Edmund Place will have a demonstrable effect on the Brush Park Historic District, and that such demonstrable effect is likely to be beneficial, due to the contribution to the streetscape and compatibility with the neighboring historic houses, as well as with the other surrounding buildings.

Commissioner Simmons: SUPPORT

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED.

IX APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

1. 14943 Greenview, Rosedale Park

Staff: This house was built in 1936 and contributes to the Rosedale Park historic district. Proposed work is a garage behind the house. The original garage was lost to a fire, the applicant removed/demolished the remains of that garage, and began erecting a new garage. That work was noticed and stopped, so the existing condition is that a new garage frame has been built. Staff finds the new work to be compatible and appropriate. There were a couple items that staff flagged as potential concerns: the drawings show the gable ends but not the sides of building, paint is not known, fascia and soffit materials not indicated, the complete dimensions are needed—13'tall at peak, 16 feet wide, and one missing dimension. Also, the foundation material is missing. Overall, staff thought that the proposed design meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Design Elements for Rosedale Park.

Applicant not present.

Public hearing comments? None online or in auditorium.

Chair opened discussion with commissioners.

Does staff have a roof pitch ratio? Staff does not, but believes it looks similar to the old.

Is there a site plan? Staff requested one, but did not receive it. Commissioner would like to see that.

ACTION

Commissioner King moved: Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00260 for 14943 Greenview**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application WILL BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following conditions:

- The applicant shall submit final dimensioned drawings of the garage, including a site plan, which outline paint color(s) and materials to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of the permit.
- Vinyl shall not be used on the new construction and all trim shall be made of wood or a cementitious material (with a smooth finish).
- The garage's walls, asphalt roofing, soffits, fascia, and exterior doors shall be finished with colors that are compatible with those found at the property's historic house.

Commissioner Simmons: SUPPORT.

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED.

2. 3410 Brush, Brush Park

Staff: 3410 Brush Street is a one-story brick commercial structure located in the Brush Park Historic District. The building features classical detailing such as decorative brick work, a dentil cornice, and stepped parapet corners that contribute to its historic character. The building was painted without commission approval sometime between April 2023 and April 2024 prior to recent compliance measures. Applicant is now seeking approval for two new exterior work items: (1) resurfacing existing parking lot (2) constructing a new masonry trash enclosure. Commission should note that staff has already approved a partial storefront replacement and the repainting of the building in a historically appropriate light olive gray as part of Certificates of Appropriateness under earlier work in March and April 2025. The construction of a new trash enclosure falls outside staff authority to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. After examining the submitted plans, staff finds that the proposed trash enclosure is compatible in terms of materials, massing, and placement, and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, particularly Standard 9. The enclosure will not damage or obscure historic materials and its design remains clearly distinguishable from the historic fabric of the structure while still being contextually appropriate. Therefore, staff recommends approval of a certificate of appropriateness for both the resurfacing of the parking lot and the construction of the masonry trash enclosure.

Applicant is present online. Chair invited applicant to state their name for the record and be sworn in. Joanne Brown. The painting of the building was done by the City; applicant did not. Chair states that she has a certificate of appropriateness to repaint in a historically compatible color, so the only items before the commission tonight are the resurfacing and the trash enclosure.

Chair asks for public comment. None offered, either online or in the room.

Chair closed the public hearing and opened the commissioner discussion.

ACTION

Commissioner Hamilton moved: Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00398 for 3410 Brush**, 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 Simmons: SUPPORT

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

None

XI PUBLIC COMMENT

None

XII APPLICATIONS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

A. 1039 Seyburn—HDC2025-00230—West Village HD

a. Applicant Nathan Brown present. Had nothing to add to the application.

b. **ACTION:**

Commissioner Simmons moved: Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00230 for 1039 Seyburn**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application WILL BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following conditions:

- The wood trim and finish carpentry, including the fascia, soffits, and porch roof, shall replicate the historic details in-kind. The project drawings shall be revised to reflect the replication of the damaged detail.
- A final window order shall be submitted to staff for review, which includes:
 - Transom windows at the two centered bay windows at the front (East) façade
 - Specifications for the glass transparency level
 - Specifications of the opacity of the screens
- A historic mortar mix shall be used for the proposed tuckpointing, as the mortar must be softer than the historic brick and match the composition of the existing historic mortar.
- A sample of the replacement brick shall be provided to staff for review and approval to ensure that it is suitable for exterior use and is compatible in texture, color, and dimension with the adjacent historic brick.

- A new design for the back and front doors, rear porch/deck and railing, and front porch roof and railing shall be selected and submitted to staff for review and approval.
- The final dimensioned plan for the new rear deck shall be submitted to staff for review and approval.

Commissioner King: SUPPORT

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED.

B. 19410 Canterbury--HDC2025-00191—Sherwood Forest HD

- a. Applicant Johnny Merehouyas, present online, sworn in.
- b. Discussion: Commissioner Hamilton notes that the portion of the application to replace historic windows has been withdrawn, so applicant is only seeking approval to replace the house's vinyl windows at this time.

c. **ACTION:**

Commissioner Simmons moved: Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00191 for 19410 Canterbury**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application WILL BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS for the proposed work.

Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED.

C. *1725 Seyburn—HDC2025-00300—West Village HD

- a. Applicant Tracy Lowe present and sworn in. Had nothing to add to application.

b. **ACTION**

MOTION 1 of 2: Commissioner Hamilton moved: Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00300 for 1725 Seyburn**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed replacement of wood windows with vinyl windows, installation of vinyl siding and erection of the rear porch WILL NOT BE APPROPRIATE according

to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a DENIAL,

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

2) The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

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

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

The Commission's reason for denial is that:

WINDOWS

- The historic windows on the dwelling are distinctive character-defining features; the house is not highly decorated and the evenly spaced, consistently proportioned six-over-ones with divided lights on the front and sides of the house provide rhythm and interest. The historic windows are an important architectural component of the structure.
- The conditions of the historic windows have not been assessed for repairability.
- The proposed/installed replacement windows are not adequate matches to the historic windows. They do not match the design of the original—for example, six-over-ones became one-over-ones, and six-over-sixes and sliders were also introduced to the mix. Historic window openings have been reduced in many cases, changing proportions of the historic house. In addition, vinyl is not an adequate substitute material for historic wood. Because vinyl is not as strong as wood, its structural members have to be much thicker than wood structural members in the same size opening, changing the house's proportions, and its texture is different as well.
- The documentation provided does not make it entirely clear which windows were replaced recently, which (if any) had been replaced over time and were no longer original, and which historic windows will remain in place.

SIDING

- The historic wood shingle siding on the dwelling is a distinctive character-defining feature; the house is not highly decorated and the shingle siding on the historic house's second floor, as well as on the dormers, provides texture, dimension, and interest. The historic siding is an important architectural component of the structure. It should have therefore been retained and repaired. If the siding was deteriorated beyond repair, it should have been replaced in kind.
- The conditions of the historic siding have not been assessed for repairability prior to its removal or covering with the current vinyl siding
- The proposed/installed replacement vinyl siding is not an adequate match to the historic shingle cladding. The vinyl does not match the design of the original wood siding—for example, the shingles have a surface texture and the bottom of each row is varied and not straight across in neat, straight rows, lending an irregular, varied texture to the upper story and dormer sides, whereas the installed vinyl siding appears uniform

and monolithic, especially on the sides of the house. The wood shingle cladding provides texture, whereas the vinyl siding has a flat appearance. Additionally, the bright white color of the vinyl is different from the quiet earth tones the historic shingle siding would have been.

REAR PORCH

- The proposed/installed porch is not compatible with the house's historic materials or features. Specifically, the use of the fencing as porch guardrail and the pressure-treated post extending to the ground instead of to a porch deck surface are not appropriate for the house's Craftsman character, both in terms of materials and design.

Commissioner Marquez: SUPPORT

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED.

[Chairperson Franklin arrived.]

Motion 2 of 2: Commissioner Hamilton moved: Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00300 for 1725 Seyburn**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the 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

Chair Franklin: ABSTAIN

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Abstentions: 1

MOTION CARRIED.

Chair encourages applicant to continue to work with staff to create a new application that the commission could review and hopefully approve in the future.

Chairperson Franklin thanks Commissioner Machielse for chairing the meeting before her arrival.

D. 1068 Hubbard—HDC2025-00291—Hubbard Farms HD

- a. Applicant and representative are present virtually. Matthew Lenhoff, homeowner, and contractor Patrick Girvan present and sworn in. Homeowner wants to clarify that all stained glass and leaded glass windows would remain untouched. Contractor describes that the installation is a pocket installation so all interior trim stays and the touch to the existing window is minimally touched. Pella is proposed, wood with aluminum cladding, window configurations will remain as they are. Homeowner mentions that with only two working counterbalances on the windows, and windows not able to stay up on their own, this would not be a good situation in an emergency.
- b. Discussion—commissioner states that the windows look to be in repairable condition. Operation is typically an issue of paint buildup, interior trim looks varnished, he thinks it would take about an hour per window to get the windows roped and rebalanced. Another commissioner agrees—when historic windows are sticky or won't open, those are the things you fix with historic windows. Once repaired, these windows would stay up and be easy to open. The historic windows are beautiful and would operate. Homeowner is concerned about energy efficiency and heating his house. Is concerned about his family's health and safety. Commissioner states that heat loss from a house is usually from the top of the house because heat rises. Homeowner had third-floor windows replaced eight years ago and believes that the Standards have changed since then. His attic has been insulated, but you can feel cold air through the windows. Director Landsberg asks if the homeowner has considered storm windows. Homeowner questions how a storm window looks better than replica Pella windows. Director Landsberg explains that the commission follow the National Park Service's Standards and Guidelines and that storm windows protect the original windows and that in the US, the historic materials are valued and that it's about those materials, not aesthetics. Chair calls for a motion. Chair states that she wants to emphasize that it is not about aesthetics—that this commission is guided by the historic guidelines and the element of design and while the commission empathizes with the issues the homeowner is experiencing, the Guidelines state that unless historic windows are in irreparable condition, the commission does not approve window replacement. The application does not show that kind of deterioration. Director Landsberg offered some guidance about storm windows. Commissioner explains that historic windows can be made airtight as part of the restoration process. Mr. Girvan states that when the weight pockets need to be rehabilitated, the interior trim gets destroyed. Commissioners dispute that. Commissioner Simmons recommends that the homeowner seek the services of a company that repairs and restores historic windows. She had her windows restored and weights preserved and restored on her historic windows in the last year and the destruction Mr. Girvan describes is not what she experienced. When you work with a windows restoration professional, that damage can be avoided.

c. **ACTION**

Commissioner Marquez moved:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00291 for 1068 Hubbard**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the replacement of historic windows **WILL NOT BE APPROPRIATE** according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore **ISSUES a DENIAL**,

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

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

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

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

The Commission's reason for denial is that:

- The wood windows proposed for replacement are distinctive, character-defining features of the property.
- The current application does not provide documentation of each window proposed for replacement that demonstrates that they are deteriorated beyond repair.
- The existing historic windows proposed for replacement should therefore be retained and repaired in kind, where necessary.

Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT

[Director Landsberg notes that **Commissioner Trudeau has arrived.**]

Chair Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Commissioner Trudeau: ABSTAINS

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Abstentions: 1

MOTION CARRIED.

Chair encourages homeowner to contact a window restoration company who can come out and assess windows and provide an assessment.

E. *1676 Chicago—HDC2025-00292—Boston-Edison HD

- a. Applicant Meir Israel present remotely and sworn in.
- b. Discussion: Commissioner states that he believed the staff report was pretty straightforward.
- c. **ACTION**

MOTION 1 of 2: Commissioner Marquez moved:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00292 for 1676 Chicago**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed replacement of the soffits and installation of asphalt shingles at the dormer roofs WILL NOT BE

APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a DENIAL,

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

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

The Commission's reason for denial is that:

- While the newly installed soffits/dentils are wood, in keeping with the original soffit's material, they do not match the historic appearance.
- The soffit that was removed was a distinctive character-defining feature of the property which, per the standards, should be matched if deteriorated beyond repair.
- The number of front facing dentils (excluding the corners) was reduced from 22 to 13. The spacing of the original dentils created a rhythm that aligned with the outer walls of the dormers (see arrows), and tied together the elaborate portico, the linear keystones above the windows, as well as the vertical pattern of the original tile roof.
- The new existing widely spaced dentils are out of proportion with the cohesive patterning of the applied ornament and the decorative coursing of the brick veneer.

Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT

Chair Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Commissioner Trudeau: AYE

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION 2 of 2: Commissioner Marquez moved:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00292 for 1676 Chicago**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the installation of shingles at the main roof 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

Chair Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Commissioner Trudeau: AYE

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED.

Chair encouraged homeowner to continue to work with staff. Commissioner Hamilton points out that staff noted that there is continued work around the front door and that work continues to be in violation and so will need to be resolved with a new, future application.

F. *305 Eliot—HDC2025-00311—Brush Park HD

- a. Applicant, Michele Penney, representing Victors Home Solutions, reviewed the proposed/recommended denial. Wanted to speak regarding the DaVinci composite shingles product proposed for the sides of the dormers. Reasons for composite: financial burden not justified. Contractor thought that the sides of the dormers were included in the roof project. Natural slate costs twice as much as the composite. The proposed composite is designed to match the texture, coursing, and detail of real slate, and it states in the manufacturer's brochure that they use moldings of real slate to avoid a repeatable pattern, and the lightweight durability of this is good for the homeowner for this correction. Performance will exceed that of natural slate. Homeowner was getting squirrels in there and that slate did need to be replaced. This will be on a second story and the commission has samples. There are a few color options; proposed is Aurora. Chair acknowledges for the record that a sample of the Aurora color of the composite product is being circulated among commissioners.
- b. Discussion:
 - i. Commissioner states that this product does seem to have a comparable look to slate for this application.
 - ii. Commissioner clarifies that this is a correction to a violation; confirmed. Asked whether the contractor did the removal; applicant confirmed. Applicant explained that they got approval but did not realize the dormers were not part of the approval. Commissioner clarified that the information they have is that the application did not include the sides of the dormers and staff confirmed that with the applicant. Ms Penney apologized—she did not understand that the dormers were not included. Ms Penney stated that the homeowner had prior repairs done to the dormers not by Victors; Victors does not normally work on slate. Commissioner asked whether Victors had completed an assessment of the slate on the sides of the dormer to determine whether that slate was beyond repair. Ms Penney states that they did not. The homeowner asked them to address the flashing and slate on the sides of the dormers because squirrels were getting in and it is her understanding that the homeowner had had the slate repaired before. Commissioner wishes that the homeowner were present at the meeting; without an assessment regarding the condition of the slate when it was in place, she would have to agree with the staff recommendation.

- iii. Commissioner states that the dormers clad in slate were character-defining features of the house, especially the side-facing dormers. Having said that, this proposed composite has a similar look and feel to the slate and would be better than the asphalt with wrapped corers now in place.
- iv. Commissioner states that the argument being made is around cost, but the company being represented today doesn't have slate expertise and can't really speak to condition or cost, and the work was done in violation.
- v. Commissioner appreciates the further discussion and the more detailed look at the corner conditions. Looking at how the proposed material would be mitered for the matching corner, and also how the proposed material would meet the wood vertical trim at the corners of the dormers. Natural slate has a thickness that meets that wood, and the composite is thinner. Ms Penney states that the new product would be tucked behind that wood trim piece so that it would be flush behind it. They would make those same cuts so it would look like the slate. Commissioner acknowledged that the discussion around replacement is probably premature since the first question about feasibility of a slate-for-slate replacement has not yet been answered. This is perhaps after that step, if the one-for-one replacement proves infeasible.

c. ACTION

Commissioner Simmons moved: Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00311 for 305 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 replacement of the slate dormer siding WILL NOT BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a DENIAL,

as 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 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."
- 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: 8, 10 and 19

The Commission's reason for denial is that:

- A plasticized tile product is not consistent with the general characteristics of a wall cladding material for a late 19th century house.
- Manufactured products have a limited range of profiled edges, so it is possible a repeating pattern will be noticed

- It is not known how the composite material will react long term to the elements, unlike natural slate, affecting, or not affecting its surface finish. In addition to the overlay repair of the wood, The resin material will always look “new”, and a natural patina will not be developed.
- As the slate tiles were distinctive character-defining features of the historic dormers and were removed without HDC approval, the installation of new or salvaged natural slate tiles with an identical dimension, pattern, color and surface finish as the historic slate tiles is reasonably available and technically feasible.

Commissioner Trudeau: SUPPORT

Further discussion: Commissioner is concerned about insisting on slate on those side dormers. Commissioner Simmons clarifies that this motion doesn’t propose to put slate there; it instead asks to demonstrate that slate would not be a feasible material. Commissioner Simmons is essentially saying that the proposal is incomplete—the commission doesn’t have credible insight as to whether slate is feasible. The commission is missing the part of the application that addresses the slate, in addition to the violation. Commissioner asks whether the commission would be looking for a cost estimate for slate; Commissioner Simmons stated that since cost was part of the argument that the applicant made, then cost does need to be evaluated for feasibility. Commissioner also would want to see how that corner condition would be addressed by the applicant.

Chair Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: ABSTAIN

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: NAY

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Commissioner Trudeau: AYE

Ayes: 5 Nays: 1 Abstentions: 1

MOTION CARRIED.

G. 2814 Oakman—HDC2025-00295—Oakman Blvd HD

- a. Applicant Deric Tedora present. Customer is currently experiencing some leaks, proposed is a full roof replacement, new fascia boards, want to do new ventilated soffits, and want to wrap fascia and frieze boards in aluminum to preserve the wood moving forward, and there are some missing gutters and downspouts they’d like to replace.
- b. Discussion: Commissioner mentioned to the applicant that staff has recommended that turbine vents not be used. Applicant stated that they could use box vents instead; current code would require 13 box vents. Commissioner explained that staff recommends wood soffits remain wood and staff could likely approve adding some venting to the wood soffits.

c. ACTION

Commissioner Simmons moved: Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00295 for 2814 Oakman**, 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:

- Turbine vents cannot be installed at the property's roof. Rather, flat box or can vents shall be installed at the roof surface. Staff shall have the authority to review and approve the final ventilation plan.
- The existing wood frieze board shall not be wrapped in aluminum. Areas of deteriorated frieze board shall be replaced in kind to match existing.
- The existing wood soffits shall not be replaced with vinyl soffits. Areas of deteriorated soffits shall be replaced in kind to match existing.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

Chair Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Commissioner Trudeau: AYE

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED.

Chair clarified for the applicant that they should be getting their certificate of appropriateness in a week or so and that they need to work within the confines of that certificate. If they run into something unexpected, they need to contact the HDC staff before continuing.

H. *1760 Wabash—HDC2025-00404—Corktown HD

- a. Applicant Alissa Jacobs present online, with architect Tim Flintoff, present online, and both sworn in. The architect met with Ms Dye on site and they'll work with staff to make sure that everything gets properly primed, painted, and permitted in the permitting process.
- b. Discussion: Commissioner stated is in agreement with staff recommendations; another commissioner agreed.
- c. **ACTION:**

Commissioner Machielse moved: Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00404 for 1760 Wabash** 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:

- Specifications for glass and screens will be submitted to staff for review, confirming transparency of the window openings will be retained.
- The final window order will be submitted to staff for review.
- The drawings will be updated to list the previously approved paint colors for the wood siding and window trim and casings, as well as the dimensions and installation specifications for the 7.25" western red cedar siding.

Commissioner King: SUPPORT

Chair Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE
Commissioner Simmons: AYE
Commissioner Trudeau: AYE
Ayes: 7 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED.

I. *141 W Boston—HDC2025-00388--Boston-Edison HD

- a. Applicant Derek Berk present online and sworn in. Applicant has searched exhaustively for an appropriate replacement roof for the home and the garage. Ludowici still making tiles from Ohio, and these are what he proposes.
- b. Discussion—none.
- c. ACTION

Commissioner Simmons moved: Motion: Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00388 for 141 W. Boston**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application WILL BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following conditions:

- Any trim at the roof's eaves (to include the soffit, fascia, and brackets) which is targeted for replacement due to deterioration shall be replicated/replaced in kind.
- The remaining clay tile at the property's carriage house/garage be retained/shall not be removed.

Commissioner Hamilton: SUPPORT

Chair Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE
Commissioner Simmons: AYE
Commissioner Trudeau: AYE
Ayes: 7 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED.

J. *691 W Canfield—HDC2025-00407—W Canfield HD

- a. Applicants Doug Pattison, Rosanne Pattison, present online and sworn in.

- b. Discussion: Commissioner clarified that with infill bricks, commission usually requests that the bricks be recessed a little. Applicant explained that they have enough original/historic brick that it can be just toothed right in.
- c. ACTION

Commissioner King moved: Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00407 for 691 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.

The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following conditions:

- The applicant supply staff with a final dimensioned sketch of the front basement windows with the finished mullion in place prior to the issuance of the project's permit
- The material of the window wells and the door at the rear façade, basement level shall be compatible with the building's historic character, as determined by staff
- Anywhere bricks will be used to infill, the bricks need to be a good match for the building both in color but also in hardness/strength, the bricks need to be exterior-grade quality for use outdoors, and the mortar used must be lime-based, soft mortar.
- The new rear deck and patio will either be painted or stained wood; no unpainted pressure-treated wood will be visible above ground. Also, applicant shall propose a new skirting design for the new rear patio which is more compatible with historic buildings and the railing for the new deck shall be wood, rather than the proposed aluminum. The final railing design shall be submitted to staff for review and approval.

Commissioner Marquez: SUPPORT.

Chair Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Commissioner Simmons: AYE

Commissioner Trudeau: AYE

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED.

XIII CITY PROJECTS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

None

XIV OLD BUSINESS

None

XV NEW BUSINESS

1. Site Plan Review per Section 50-3-204—SLU2025-00078—1516-1524 Vinewood—Hubbard Farms HD

Commissioner Machielse recused himself.

Director Landsberg, through the chair: This site plan review process is still new to the commission. Began reviewing these types of projects in March 2025 at Law's direction. Per this section of the zoning code, this commission is required to sit as a "team member" during review of site plan reviews submitted through the Buildings Department or through the special land use hearing process. We are still working through to a best practice for this. Staff will outline what the site plan submissions are about, highlight and share information, and will not make a recommendation. The commission is then asked to use the template provided by the advisory opinion--that is, the determination whether the proposed project as depicted will have a demonstrable impact on the district and whether that impact (if it exists) will be beneficial or adverse.

[Staff Jennifer Ross outlined some findings.] 1926 building date, temporary permit issued for parking expired in 1980. Staff approved a site plan in 2022 for the building's reuse as an apartment building. By the 1970s, apartment building with lightwell existed and the house next door was demolished. Empty lot used as an informal gravel parking lot for several years. By 2014, apartment building is vacant and the parking lot is growing grass. Now, parking lot has been graded, building rehab well underway, and a plan for the parking lot will be submitted to the commission for approval next month. This is a site plan review, so commission can comment on entire proposal. Commissioner noted that, usually, there is more of a dedicated greenbelt (more than 1.8 feet between the existing fence and the parking blocks). Commissioner stated that it seems that having this parking lot would be beneficial for the historic building. Commissioner noted that the site plan noted that there is a wrought iron fence proposed and commission should see that fence, and commissioner stated that the courtyard is a nice amenity for this building type and is sad to see the courtyard go. Commissioner noted that there is no landscaping between the lot and the garden court apartments, and he would recommend landscaping to screen those residents from parked headlights.

ACTION:

Commissioner King moved: The commission finds that the proposed project at 1516 and 1524 Vinewood will have a demonstrable effect on the Hubbard Farms Historic District and;

that such demonstrable effect is likely to be beneficial due to the fact of reinvigorating an existing multifamily dwelling as part of the neighborhood, and it is suggested that the applicant consider adding shrubbery and vegetation in the courtyard to block the effects of parking cars.

Commissioner Hamilton: Support.

Commissioner noted that the ADA-accessible spot should be bigger and the other spots could be smaller, but it was decided that this will likely be checked through the building department's site plan approval process and that the historic district commission likely should not weigh in on this aspect of the plan since it is not within the commission's purview.

Chair Franklin: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: RECUSED
Commissioner Marquez: AYE
Commissioner Simmons: AYE
Commissioner Trudeau: AYE
Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Recusals: 1

MOTION CARRIED.

2. Site Plan Review per Section 50-3-204—SLU2025-00057 & SLU2025-00058 1021 Manistique & 14635 East Jefferson—Jefferson Chalmers Historic Business HD [Commissioner Machielse returned to the auditorium.]

[Staff Jennifer Ross outlined some findings.] Two parcels, historically served as the St Columba Episcopal Church (1927) and its associated assembly hall. Existing greenspaces, two curbcuts, proposed are two new parking lots to support loft uses. Proposed is widening of curbcut leading to more formal parking lots. Greenspace is preserved.

Commissioner seeks to clarify whether an alley was vacated; it appears on Parcel Viewer that it must have been vacated.

Commissioner stated that this looks like proposals the commission has approved in the past.

ACTION:

Commissioner Hamilton moved: The commission finds that the proposed project at 1021 Manistique and 14635 East Jefferson will have a demonstrable effect on the Jefferson Chalmers Historic District and; that such demonstrable effect is likely to be beneficial in support of the revitalization of the building that will preserve it as a contributing element in the historic district.

Commissioner King: Support.

Chair Franklin: AYE
Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
Commissioner King: AYE
Commissioner Machielse: AYE
Commissioner Marquez: AYE
Commissioner Simmons: AYE
Commissioner Trudeau: AYE
Ayes: 7 Nays: 0

MOTION CARRIED.

XVI ADJOURNMENT

ACTION (7:21 p.m.)

Commissioner Simmons moved to adjourn.

Commissioner Machielse: SUPPORT

MOTION CARRIED

Chairperson Franklin thanked commissioners, Director Landsberg, and staff, and adjourned the meeting at 7:22 p.m.