

MINUTES

DETROIT HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

February 11, 2026

Coleman A. Young Municipal Center, Suite 808

I CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Machielse called the meeting to order at 4:39 p.m.

II ROLL CALL

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION		PRESENT	ABSENT
Tiffany Franklin	Chair	X—arrived at 5:55	
James Hamilton	Commissioner	X	
Marcus King	Commissioner	X	
Allan Machielse	Vice Chair	X	
William Marquez	Commissioner	X	
Adrea Simmons	Commissioner		X
STAFF			
Audra Dye	PDD	X	
Garrick Landsberg (Director)	PDD	X	
Jennifer Ross	PDD	X	
Lise St James	PDD	X	
Bilqees Salie	PDD		X
Ellen Thackery	PDD	X	

III APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

ACTION

Commissioner Hamilton moved to move the applications for 100 Michigan Avenue and 9602 E Jefferson to the consent agenda. Commissioner Marquez: SUPPORT.

ROLL CALL

- Commissioner King: AYE
- Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
- Commissioner Machielse: AYE
- Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Motion passed, 4-0.

ACTION

Commissioner Hamilton moved to approve the agenda as modified.
Commissioner King: SUPPORT

ROLL CALL

- Commissioner King: AYE
- Commissioner Hamilton: AYE
- Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 4 Nays: 0

MOTION PASSED 4-0

IV APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

ACTION

Commissioner King moved to approve the January meeting minutes.

Commissioner Marquez: SUPPORT

ROLL CALL

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 4 Nays: 0

MOTION PASSED, 4-0

V REPORTS

Director Landsberg reported that the staff has been working on completing the annual report for the Certified Local Government program. That report compiles our work from the year in numbers, and we'll get that to the Commission once complete.

VI APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO CONSENT AGENDA

ACTION

Commissioner Hamilton moved to approve the consent agenda.

Commissioner Marquez: SUPPORT.

ROLL CALL

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

MOTION PASSES 4-0. Vice chair reiterates that these approvals are subject to staff conditions.

VII POSTPONED APPLICATIONS

None

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

None

IX SITE PLAN REVIEWS (per Section 50-3-204 of the 2019 Detroit City Code)

2001 Park – SPR2025-00083 - GRAND CIRCUS PARK HD – JR

Staff report.

ACTION

Commissioner Hamilton moved that no comments be returned in response to HDC involvement in the site plan review for 2001 Park.

Commissioner King: SUPPORTED.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Ayes: 4 Nays: 0

MOTION PASSED, 4-0

X APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

8029 Coe/1500-1532 Van Dyke – HDC2025-00706 – West Village HD—GL –Demolish two houses, erect multi-family building

Staff report.

Present and sworn in are applicant Clifford Brown, President and CEO of Woodborne, the developer, as well as the owner of Coe Van Dyke II, owner of the property, and John Davis, Executive VP of Operations and Acquisitions for Woodborne.

Applicants:

- described that they don't want to demolish the homes and have offered them for free to someone who can move them. They won't begin that demolition (if allowed) until the summer.
- Also described the design revisions they have made based on feedback—removed townhomes, reduced footprint, increased parking.
- Described the community benefits of the project.

Chair opened the public hearing.

- Robert Rhodes, 733 Seyburn, West Village. Opposes the project because it, along with Coe I, diminish the historic fabric and character of the neighborhood. The design might be fine somewhere else, but it is not right for this neighborhood.
- Joanne Warwick, opposes the project. Too much of historic Detroit has been lost. This project could be built elsewhere on vacant land.
- Jermaine Ruffin, Senior VP of Neighborhoods at Invest Detroit. Supports the project. Described that there were several community meetings and the developer has been receptive to community feedback.
- Amy Hemmeter, lives nearby in Islandview and is supportive of the project.

- Michelle Potter, lives around the block on Parker Street. Opposes the project as it is proposed— supports more gentle density but not these oppressive buildings.
- Josh Bails, East Region Development Director on the Public-Private Partnership Team in the City’s Housing and Revitalization Department, supports.
- Matt Daniels, opposed. This project could happen elsewhere and the houses to be demolished were purchased by the Land Bank and then neglected and are now endangered. This is antithetical to the purpose of the Historic District Commission and a dangerous precedent.
- Luis Antonio Uribeagan, supports. Similar project in his neighborhood has been beneficial.
- Amber Cecil, lives directly behind the proposed project. Opposes. Most neighbors oppose. Homeowners all have to maintain their properties and historic materials and they have demolished by neglect and sidestepped the process.
- John Bolt, resident, supports project. Supports the investment and doesn’t understand why that development and investment would be held up.
- Regina Kuper, 35-year resident of Indian Village. Opposes. New apartment buildings have some vacancy whereas historic buildings do not. There is plenty of vacant land elsewhere for a project like this.
- Tatjana Jackson, a founder of Detroit Historic Districts Alliance. Opposes. Developments like this and demolitions like this hurt Detroit’s character, community, uniqueness, and significance.

Chair closed the public hearing at 5:36 PM.

[Commission discussion.

Discussed whether the development considered preserving the houses on site. They have but would be too expensive. One was fire damaged, and both were in a state of deferred maintenance before the fire. Developer stated that they are very invested in the neighborhoods they develop in. They are trying very hard to address concerns and think they have done that and they seek consensus.

Clarified—are they seeking to move houses or demolish them? They are offering them to anyone who can take them but they cannot stay where they are. They won’t be in construction until September so there is some time. Developer seeks approval from HDC so they can seek funding from DEGC, who won’t offer any funding until HDC approval is granted.

Commissioner expressed concern about the demolition because these houses are contributing houses to the district, may be some of the oldest houses in the District.

Commissioner moved into design review of the project. He believes scale is better than the previous version, but shares staff concerns about some of the aesthetics. Lack of stoops/lack of an approach to the street is a problem for this design, and the horizontal emphasis is an issue in this neighborhood. That horizontality needs to be broken up to make the design more compatible for this neighborhood. Houses in the neighborhood tend to be narrower and taller rather than wide/horizontal.

Commissioner discussion about this development and how Coe and Van Dyke interact and how parking lots affect neighborhood.

Commissioner discussion about whether the proposed building is of sufficient value and benefit to let the small cottages go.

Commissioner discussion about how a historic neighborhood can grow and not lose its character. Commissioner expressed concern about material—the brick feels monolithic. Commissioner expressed that the building feels not specific to the site, not one of a kind as development in a historic district requires. The proposed building needs more variety and richness of detail. The first Coe building has more expression. Our job as historic district commissioners is not mimic the old but respond to context and ensure that new buildings are sensitive to their historic surroundings. Yes, differentiated, but also compatible is the requirement of the Standards.

Commissioner notes there is no support letter or opposition letter from the West Village neighborhood association; one commissioner is troubled by that absence.

Commissioner asked the developer about Coe 1 and how it has vertical elements and the massing is broken up by the articulated elements and shadows and how that one feels site specific, and this one does not. Developer responded about the design process for this building. Commissioner reiterated that design details matter. The townhouse iteration of the design successfully broke up the massing.

Commissioner comes back to the demolition of the two houses. Acknowledges they're simple structures, but the eclectic nature of West Village makes it unique. Maybe this size of a building and this design is not appropriate for this location.

Commission discussion about a notice to proceed and procedure and requirements.

Commission discussion about moving houses and feasibility.

Commission discussion about how if the cottages will be lost, the design of the new building should be of sufficient note to offset that loss.

More procedural discussion.]

ACTION

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00706 for 8029 Coe/1500-1532 Van Dyke**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application WILL NOT BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a NOTICE TO PROCEED for the proposed work.

The Commission's reasons for the notice to proceed is that:

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

The Notice to Proceed is suspended and not issued until:

- (1) The applicant submits final construction documents, including specifications, incorporating a conceptual approach here approved, for final review and approval by the Historic District Commission.
- (2) All other necessary approvals, including planning, zoning, financing, and environmental clearances, are documented and provided to HDC/PDD staff.

Commissioner King: SUPPORTED

Discussion:

Director Landsberg recommended replacing “final construction documents” with “design drawings” instead. Commissioner requests a friendly amendment of the phrase “final development drawings” to “design development drawings.” Commissioner Hamilton accepts that amendment. Commissioner King still supported.

Commissioner Machielse requested an amendment that a condition be included in the motion that the applicant should continue to market the structures for relocation. Commissioner Hamilton accepted that amendment. Commissioner King still supported.

Director Landsberg questioned whether Commissioner Hamilton would want to revise the phrase “conceptual approach here approved” since the design still needs revisions, according to the Commission, and the developer and the staff need to know what needs to change to bring the proposal back before the Commission. Commissioner Machielse stated that the Design Elements the design does not meet are Elements of Design 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 18, and 19. Commissioner Marquez stated that, when reviewing the design, the Commission discussed that the design needs to address the concerns around expression, massing, articulation, variety and richness of detail, the monolithic brick, horizontal suggestions and some materials and textures that could be considered.

[Commission discussed the pros and cons of making the motion specific or more general, and whether a notice to proceed or a denial is more appropriate.]

Commissioner King offered the following language as a friendly amendment for Condition 1: “This notice to proceed is suspended and not issued until the applicant submits final design development documents, including specifications, that address Element of Design 2 that references the proportion of buildings’ front façade and returns with a design that breaks up the horizontal mass of the building, and be submitted for final review and approval by the Historic District Commission.”

Commissioner Hamilton did not accept that amendment because he thought it was too vague.

Director Landsberg offered the language: “The applicant submits design development documents addressing design issues identified in the commission discussion for final review and approval.”

Commissioner Hamilton requested the phrase to be repeated; Director Landsberg stated, “The applicant submits design development documents, including specifications, addressing design issues identified in Commission discussion, for final approval by the Historic District Commission.”

Commissioner Hamilton reiterated that the third condition is still included as well regarding moving the houses.

FINAL MOTION

Commissioner Hamilton moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00706 for 8029 Coe/1500-1532 Van Dyke**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the proposed application WILL NOT BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a NOTICE TO PROCEED for the proposed work.

The Commission's reason for the notice to proceed is that:

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

The Notice to Proceed is suspended and not issued until:

- (1) The applicant submits design development drawings (including specifications) that address design issues identified in the Commission discussion, for final review and approval by the Historic District Commission.
- (2) All other necessary approvals, including planning, zoning, financing, and environmental clearances, are documented and provided to HDC/PDD staff.
- (3) Applicant should continue to market the buildings for relocation.

Commissioner King supported.

ROLL CALL

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Commissioner Franklin: ABSTAIN

MOTION PASSED 4-0, with one abstention.

4825 Fullerton – HDC2026-00004 – Russell Woods-Sullivan HD – LSJ – Demolish rear two-story porch, erect rear two-story porch

Staff report.

Faris Fakhouri, City of Detroit, and Christian Fahoome, Everclean Restoration, present and sworn in.

Mr. Fakhouri summarized proposal.

Chair opened public hearing.

Caller not identified. Urged the Commission to pay attention to the people who live nearby the proposal.

No other commenters.

Chair closed the public hearing.

Commissioner requested clarification on the drawing. Applicant clarified that the column would go all the way to the ground and meet a foundation.

Commissioner Hamilton (supported by Commissioner Machielse) moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2026-00004 for 4825 Fullerton**, 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 product information identifying the proposed replacement brick and colorway(s) and a photo of the sample new brick next to existing historic brick be provided to staff for review and approval to ensure that it is compatible in texture, color, and dimension with the adjacent historic brick.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Franklin: Aye.

Commissioner King: Aye.

Commissioner Hamilton: Aye.

Commissioner Machielse: Aye.

Commissioner Marquez: Aye.

MOTION PASSED 5-0.

Director Landsberg offered, for transparency and education, that in public hearing cases, per the ordinance, property owners and occupants within 500 feet of the properties are sent notices. The notices are sent between 10 and 20 days before the meeting. All materials, for any meeting, are on our public website, no later than 10 days before each meeting.

***1656 W Boston – HDC2026-00019 – Boston-Edison HD – ET – Demolish garage,* erect garage**

Staff report.

Architect Elise de Chard and homeowner Steve Sorenson, present and sworn in.

Architect clarified that the present property owners are not the ones who demolished the garage, and that they can give up the gate to the alley if needed. Commissioner clarified that if they want to remove the whole fence and propose another one with a gate in the future, that would be staff approvable and wouldn't need to be reviewed by the Commission.

Public hearing opened.

Caller again encouraged Commission to listen to people nearby a proposal. No name given.

No more comments.

Public hearing closed.

ACTION

Commissioner King moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2026-00019 for 1656 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:

- A color palette within Color System C will be proposed for the new garage, subject to staff review and approval,
- The non-approved stockade fence, if demolished or removed, would not be able to be reinstalled in the future, and
- A gate will not be added to the stockade fence.

Commissioner Machielse supported.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Franklin: Aye.

Commissioner King: Aye.

Commissioner Hamilton: Aye.

Commissioner Machielse: Aye.

Commissioner Marquez: Aye.

MOTION PASSED 5-0.

1530 Bagley – HDC2026-00022 – Corktown HD – AD – Erect carport

Staff report.

Architects Tim Flintoff and Joshua Maddox, of 4545 Architecture present online and sworn in.

Public hearing opened. No comments. Hearing closed.

ACTION

Commissioner Machielse (supported by Commissioner King) moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2026-00022 for 1530 Bagley**, 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.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Franklin: Aye.

Commissioner King: Aye.

Commissioner Hamilton: Aye.

Commissioner Machielse: Aye.

Commissioner Marquez: Aye.

MOTION PASSED 5-0.

XI CITY PROJECTS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

None

XII PUBLIC COMMENT

None

Chair reminded of the two applications that were approved as part of the consent agenda.

XIII APPLICATIONS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

19597 Shrewsbury – HDC2025-00740 – Sherwood Forest HD – LSJ – Replace wood windows with aluminum-clad wood windows

Amanda Weted, applicant, present and sworn in.

Ms Weted presented her application and proposal. She discussed the estimate for window restoration that she received from Terry Swafford, her utility bills, and her need for egress in an emergency. She also heard from a company that repairs wood windows in Ferndale.

Commissioner stated that the windows are very important, historic, and character defining, and sought clarification regarding the Swafford proposal.

Commissioner stated that the Commission is tasked with upholding the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and chipped paint and inconsistencies in the sashes can be repaired. The Commissioners have empathy for the situation, but they also have their charge.

ACTION

Commissioner Marquez moved (Commissioner King supported):

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00740 for 19597 Shrewsbury**, 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, as the proposed work fails to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, specifically Standards:

Standard 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.

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

Standard 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.

And

Elements of Design # 3, 7, 8, and 10.

For the following reasons:

- The existing historic wood windows are distinctive, character-defining features that have not proven to be beyond repair.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Franklin: Aye.

Commissioner King: Aye.

Commissioner Hamilton: Aye.

Commissioner Machielse: Aye.

Commissioner Marquez: Aye.

MOTION PASSED, 5-0.

100 Michigan – HDC2025-00757 & HDC2025-00758 – Capitol Park HD – ET – Install signage

As part of the consent agenda, Commissioner Hamilton moved (Commissioner Marquez supported) that: Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00757 & HDC2025-00758 for 100 Michigan**, 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.

ROLL CALL:

- Commissioner King: Aye.

- Commissioner Hamilton: Aye.
- Commissioner Machielse: Aye.
- Commissioner Marquez: Aye.

MOTION PASSED, 4-0.

19630 Roslyn – HDC2026-00005 – Sherwood Forest HD – AD – Replace existing vinyl windows with new vinyl windows

Applicant Leonard Barnes, present online and sworn in. Mr. Barnes has owned the home since 2011, applied to the commission, received certificates of appropriateness, and had windows replaced in the past. Received two COAs in the past, had approved work done, and is confused as to why the work may not be approved now.

The designation photo from 2002 shows similar windows to what is being proposed. Staff clarified that in 2022, the proposed installation of vinyl windows was denied, but in 2020, staff had issued an approval for partial window replacement. Staff clarified that in 2020, proposed were two picture windows on west façade and four picture windows on west façade. Director Landsberg clarified that that staffmember is no longer on staff and that that approval was issued in error because the National Park Service guidelines state that inappropriate windows are required to be replaced by compatible windows. So that should not have been approved.

Mr. Barnes summarized that it sounds like the first COA should not have been issued and so, in 2022, that correction was made, and that will be adhered to going forward. Chair agreed that that is a fair characterization of the situation.

Commissioner stated that staff has authority to work with applicants to get a compatible window in to replace the incompatible ones, if the homeowner would like to proceed with window replacement.

There was a misstated motion (with the incorrect address given) and then the motion below was made as a correction.

ACTION

Commissioner Hamilton (supported by Commissioner King) moved that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2026-00005 for 19630 Roslyn**, 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, as the proposed work fails to meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, specifically Standards:

Standard 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, 7 and 10

For the following reasons:

- Through the limits of fabrication and material, vinyl windows are not appropriate for historic districts for a variety of reasons.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Franklin: Aye.

Commissioner King: Aye.

Commissioner Hamilton: Aye.

Commissioner Machielse: Aye.

Commissioner Marquez: Aye.

MOTION PASSED, 5-0.

2310 Edison – HDC2026-00002 – Boston-Edison HD – AD – Install new wood windows at front

Commissioner Hamilton recused himself.

Gamal Yusmanov, contractor, and homeowners Coriel Taylor and Jonathan Taylor, present and sworn in.

Contractor explained that they seek approval for the existing vinyl windows because in 2024, the Commission approved restoration of the original windows, which were in the garage. The contractor at that time removed the original windows and never returned them. Despite the homeowners' repeated attempts, they were never able to recover their original windows. Additionally, the vinyl windows he did install were installed incorrectly without proper sealing or caulk and then the contractor disappeared. The homeowners are pursuing legal action, but, in the meantime, there are no historic windows to repair. Acknowledging that the vinyl is incompatible with the historic district, the proposal is to replace the vinyl windows with wood windows.

Staff clarified: The wood windows were removed by the initial contractor, without approval, and vinyl windows were being installed. During that replacement, the unapproved installation of vinyl was discovered. Retroactive approval of the unapproved vinyl windows was then sought. The commission denied that application. The homeowners then came back with an application for wood replacement windows. The Commission approved the installation of the new wood windows, with the exception of the two window openings on the front at the second floor. Those windows were requested to be restored and reinstalled. (Vinyl windows in the basement openings were approved.) Now, with the historic sashes gone, the applicant seeks approval for new wood windows in those openings to match what the Commission approved elsewhere on the house.

Commissioner appreciates all the the homeowners have done to try to do the right thing and acknowledges their due diligence.

Staff changed its recommendation to approval.

ACTION

Commissioner King moved (Commissioner Marquez supported) that:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2026-00002 for 2310 Edison**, and having duly considered the appropriateness thereof pursuant to Chapter 21 Article II of the 2019 Detroit City Code, and MCL 399.205 of the Local Historic Districts Act, the Commission determines the 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.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Franklin: Aye.

Commissioner King: Aye.

Commissioner Machielse: Aye.

Commissioner Marquez: Aye.

MOTION PASSED, 4-0 with one recusal.

[Commissioner Hamilton is called back in.]

1731 Longfellow – HDC2026-00003 – Boston-Edison HD – ET – Replace historic wood windows, other alterations

Current homeowner Summer Moukalled and Glen Stern, former homeowner, present and sworn in.

Ms Moukalled explained that before purchasing the property in December (2025), she reached out to the HDC staff to understand if there were outstanding violations. She learned that windows and paint on the stucco were in violation, and a couple other items were added to the application as well. Her goal was to make the violations right.

Mr. Stern explained that he had lived in the house 10 years and, in 2021, their first child was due in October. They decided to replace the historic wood windows at that time with aluminum-clad wood windows with the configuration that matched the historic, and they corrected the first-floor picture window that was not original and not compatible with the house by installing a ribbon of windows with mullions between instead of the picture window. Regarding gutters and downspouts, they were falling off and had to be replaced, and the fascia had to be replaced as well. They were told that the soffit also had to be replaced because it contributed to the deterioration. They acknowledge that unapproved work was done but they intended to follow the Standards and Elements of Design.

Commissioner clarified—applicant never sought for approval for the work from the commission, correct? Applicant acknowledges that is correct. Commissioner states that the lack of reviews made it so the commission could not opine on the proposals. The commission could have offered guidance and alternatives.

The chair stated that the commission receives and understands the statements that have been made, but, as stated earlier in the meeting, the Commission is held to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the Elements of Design. And while the intent may have been good, we still have a responsibility.

[Discussion of windows and procedure. Discussion of muntins, profile, pattern match, but the muntins are between the glass. Front façade corrections seem most important to commission, in terms of prioritizing a remedy.]

Staff offered clarification that Mr. Stern began an application for the window replacement in 2020 but did not complete the application, and decided to go ahead with the replacement without the approval. Then, the new homeowner did reach out to the HDC before purchasing, and the staff communicated the

violations and how they would be remedied. New homeowner explained that she didn't know what the true remedy would be, and didn't know the Standards or what the actual violation was. Chair explained that in these cases, applicant usually submits a proposal showing plan to address violation.

ACTION 1 OF 2

Commissioner Machielse moved (Commissioner Marquez supported):

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2026-00003 for 1731 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 wood window replacement, replacing or covering eave details, and painting the stucco and dormers bright white 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:

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

And

Elements of Design # 7, 8, and 9

For the following reasons:

- Regarding the window replacements, the historic, character-defining wood windows were removed and replaced without first establishing the infeasibility of repair. Detailed documentation of window conditions is necessary to make this determination before replacement can be considered. Additionally, measurements of the key components of both the historic and proposed replacement windows is necessary to determine whether the proposed replacement is an adequate match for the historic windows. A third issue is that the replacement window muntins are not dimensional, like those of historic windows, i.e., between-the-glass muntins.
- Regarding the covering or replacement of trim around the house's eaves, the dimensional profile that helps to define historic wood frieze boards is lost when the features are covered (or replaced) with aluminum. The pattern of the aluminum replacement soffits draws attention to the soffits whereas they were simple and understated before the replacement. The completed replacement or covering of the frieze boards, fascia, and soffits diminishes the house's historic character.
- Regarding the painting of the stucco and dormers a bright white, bright white is not an included color in Color System E.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Franklin: Aye.
Commissioner King: Aye.
Commissioner Hamilton: Aye.
Commissioner Machielse: Aye.
Commissioner Marquez: Aye.

MOTION PASSED, 5-0.

ACTION 2 OF 2

Commissioner Machielse moved (Commissioner King supported):
Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2026-00003 for 1731 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 remaining work items WILL BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following conditions:

- Gutters and downspouts must be replaced or repainted to a color included in Color System E.

ROLL CALL:

- Commissioner Franklin: Aye.
- Commissioner King: Aye.
- Commissioner Hamilton: Aye.
- Commissioner Machielse: Aye.
- Commissioner Marquez: Aye.

MOTION PASSED, 5-0.

Applicant sought further clarification about next steps and was advised to work with staff and a licensed design professional.

4324 (4314-4316) W. Vernor – HDC2026-00018 – Hubbard Farms HD – LSH – Remove brick veneer at façade, install new brick cladding and storefront system

Tim Flintoff and Luis Antonio Uribeagan present online and sworn in.

This application was first reviewed a couple months ago and applicant brings additional information now regarding cleaning brick, and structural information as well.

Applicant describes that the footing and the top of the wall both need to be repaired, and area between is bowing and repairs would be extensive. Regarding removing paint, there are five layers of paint, so removing all of that without damaging brick faces would be very difficult. And the applicants are concerned about spalling long term if the core of the brick is exposed.

Commissioner stated that there is evidence that the brick has been bowing and the steel plates bolted on are trying to hold the brick in place. The offer to rebuild it and let staff approve for the appropriate brick seems appropriate.

Clarified brick size and consistency.

A motion was made to approve the proposed work with the conditions that the brick selection will be submitted to staff for review and approval, the parapet will be as tall as its historic height, and the glazed banding will be returned to its original location (Commissioner Marquez, supported by Commissioner Hamilton). Roll call was taken and the motion passed 5-0. Then, Commissioner Marquez began a second approval motion. It was realized that the two approval motions should be combined into one motion.

Commissioner Machielse moved that Application HDC2026-00018 be reconsidered. Commissioner Marquez seconded. Roll call was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

ACTION

Commissioner Marquez moved (Commissioner Hamilton supported):

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2026-00018 for 4324 (4314 – 4316) W. Vernor**, 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 removal of the brick veneer at the façade and installation of new brick cladding and all remaining work items WILL BE APPROPRIATE according to the standards of review set forth in the state and local legislation, and therefore ISSUES a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS for the proposed work.

The Certificate of Appropriateness is issued with the following conditions:

- The brick selection will be submitted to staff for review and approval. The brick size needs to match the historic.
- The parapet will be as tall as its historic height.
- The glazed banding will be returned to its original location.
- The proposed storefront system, including the doors, signage, dimensioned drawings and specifications, shall be provided to staff for final approval.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Franklin: Aye.

Commissioner King: Aye.

Commissioner Hamilton: Aye.

Commissioner Machielse: Aye.

Commissioner Marquez: Aye.

MOTION PASSED, 5-0.

9602 E. Jefferson – HDC2025-00756 – Joseph Berry Subdivision HD – JR – Install aluminum storefront windows and doors

Commissioner Hamilton (supported by Commissioner Marquez) moved that this application was

approved as part of the consent agenda. The approval motion was:

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00756 for 9602 E. Jefferson**, 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.

ROLL CALL:

- Commissioner King: Aye.
- Commissioner Hamilton: Aye.
- Commissioner Machielse: Aye.
- Commissioner Marquez: Aye.

MOTION PASSED, 4-0.

1676 Chicago – HDC2026-00021 – Boston-Edison HD – JR – Rehabilitate exterior

Applicants Tim Flintoff and Alissa Jacobs present online and sworn in.

Applicants provided brief overview of project, commission asked a couple questions.

[Discussion about capitals and pilasters and what is the appropriate treatment.]

Commissioner King moved (Commissioner Machielse supported):

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2026-00021 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 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 newly installed front door surround shall be replaced with a new wood surround that better matches the original. The final design shall be reviewed and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the project's permit;
- The front porch guardrails shall be made of wrought iron or steel to match to material of the original. Also, the height and design shall be consistent with the original railing. The final design shall be reviewed and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the project's permit;
- The applicant shall provide staff documentation of the condition of the two front yard trees proposed for removal. Should the trees be in good condition, they shall be retained. If they are shown to be dead, diseased, or dying, they shall be replaced with two trees at the same location and of a similar species.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Franklin: Aye.

Commissioner King: Aye.
Commissioner Hamilton: Aye.
Commissioner Machielse: Aye.
Commissioner Marquez: Aye.

MOTION PASSED, 5-0.

XIV CITY PROJECTS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC HEARING

Various Public Right-of Way – HDC2025-00699 – Various HDs – JR – Replace sewers

Applicant Gordon Pearson, Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery Program Director with Housing and Revitalization, present online and sworn in. Pei Boayue, water department, manager in the sewer design and construction.

Commissioner sought clarity about if a nonhistoric element, like a vinyl fence, were damaged as part of this work, what action would then be taken? Staff clarified that if a historic feature were damaged and could not be replicated, the proposal would need to be reviewed by the commission. In the case of a nonhistoric material being damaged, can it just be put back as it was, like a vinyl fence? Staff drafted conditions that would allow that. Commission discussed whether they believe that is appropriate.

Contractors will be required to submit before and after work photos.

[Commissioner discussion about features like trees in alleys and other concerns.]

Commissioner Marquez moved (Commissioner King supported):

Having duly reviewed the complete proposed scope of **Application HDC2025-00699 for Various Public Right-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:

- 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 and city 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 of similar 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.
- If the project will damage or require the removal of any historic/significant landscape 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 project will impact historic hardscape elements, to include brick pavers, stone curbs, etc. such elements shall be salvaged and reinstalled upon the restoration of the site if possible. If salvage is not possible and new hardscape is required, 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

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Franklin: Aye.

Commissioner King: Aye.

Commissioner Hamilton: Aye.

Commissioner Machielse: Aye.

Commissioner Marquez: Aye.

MOTION PASSED, 5-0.

XV OLD BUSINESS

None

XVI NEW BUSINESS

Director Landsberg requested a closed session for the March regular meeting.

Commissioner Marquez moved to have a closed session placed on March's regular meeting agenda.

Commissioner King SUPPORTED.

ROLL CALL

Commissioner Franklin: AYE

Commissioner King: AYE

Commissioner Hamilton: AYE

Commissioner Machielse: AYE

Commissioner Marquez: AYE

Motion passed 5-0.

XVII ADJOURNMENT

ACTION

Commissioner Machielse moved to adjourn.

Commissioner King: SUPPORTED

Chairperson Franklin adjourned the meeting at 9:45 p.m.