

11/19/2024

NOTICE OF DENIAL

Tim Flintoff
4545 Architecture
2761 E. Jefferson Ave, Ste 302
Detroit, MI 48207

**RE: Application Number HDC2024-00623; 708 Pallister; New Center Area Historic District
Scope: Unapproved As-Built Revision to Previously Approved Design, Including Alterations to Existing and New Dormers, Front Porch, Replacement of Historic Windows, Alteration of Window/Door Openings, and Other Scope Items**

Dear Applicant,

At the Regular Meeting that was held on November 13, 2024, the Detroit Historic District Commission ("DHDC") reviewed the above-referenced application. Pursuant to Section 5(1) and 9(1) of the Michigan Local Historic District Act, as amended, being MCL 399.205 (1), MCL 399.209 (9) and Sections 21-2-78 and 21-2-80 of the 2019 Detroit City Code; the DHDC hereby issues a Denial for the following work, effective on November 19, 2024, as it will be inappropriate according to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the district's Elements of Design:

Proposed as-built revisions to the originally approved February 2024 design, including alterations to existing and new dormers, front porch, replacement of historic windows, alteration of window/door openings, and other related scope items, including:

- ***Replacement of 14 (fourteen) original 2-over-1 and other multi-lite wooden single-hung windows with vinyl clad wood 1/1 windows, contrary to the Commission's approval of a plan for their preservation and restoration.***
- ***New side and rear dormers built 10'-0" wide, contrary to the Commission's approval of 7'-2" wide dormers to match the existing historic front dormer.***
- ***New side dormers built with gable-end roofs and narrow eaves, contrary to the Commission's approval of hipped roofs with wide eaves, to match the existing historic front dormer. The rear dormer, while showing a more correct roof form, was also built too wide, resulting in incompatibly narrow eaves.***
- ***Sliding, vinyl-clad windows have been installed in the new west side and rear dormer, contrary to the Commission's approval of 8-lite, simulated divided lite fibrex (Anderson 100) casement units to match the historic front dormer window.***
- ***At the new east side dormer, no window has been installed at all, contrary to the Commission's approval of an 8-lite, simulated divided lite fibrex (Anderson 100) casement unit to match the historic front dormer window.***
- ***All dormers, including the historic dormer, have been reclad with apparent vinyl or composition artificial shake shingles with imitation wood grain, contrary to the Commission's approval of true wood shake to match the historic front dormer. This artificial product is notably white in the context of the off-white ("yellowish white") paint at the rest of the house. The installation features trim pieces at the corners, instead of a mitered corner possible with true wood shake.***
- ***In addition to the artificial vinyl/composition shake treatment, all of the dormer soffits and trim/fascia***

boards (including that of the original) have been covered or faced with artificial siding, contrary to the wood soffits/trim approved by the Commission.

- *At the east (side) wall, a new window framed by vinyl or composite imitation wood grain boards was installed at a forward 1st story location, contrary to the intended replacement of the existing rearward window with an Anderson 100-unit, which location has instead been closed up. The imitation framing of the new window is noticeably wider than those at the historic windows and extends into the “belt band” separating the 1st and 2nd stories.*

- *Also at the east (side) wall, a historic 6/1 window has been removed, framed down, and infilled with a much smaller sliding window, also a vinyl-clad Anderson 400 unit.*

- *Also, at the east (side) wall, two basement windows have been replaced with glass block, contrary to the Commission’s approval to rehabilitate the existing windows here.*
- *At the west wall, not shown on either the original permit or the proposed revised drawings, a large HVAC unit has been installed at a forward position at the 1st story.*

- *At the rear, 1st story, the eastward window has been replaced with a sliding vinyl-clad (Anderson 400) window, contrary to the Commission’s approval of a new 12-light single-hung Anderson 100 window with simulated divided lites.*

- *Also at the rear, 1st story, the original pair of 2/1 windows has been replaced with a standard set of exterior French doors with between-the-glass grids, contrary to the custom 2/1 simulated divided-lite design approved by the Commission as a condition to the approval, and subsequently approved in revised permit drawings prepared by the architect, which was intended to match the consistent 2/1 historic windows present on all sides of the house.*

- *At the front, 1st story porch, the concrete block base has been veneered with new brick and then painted, contrary to the Commission’s approval of keeping the current condition with paint.*

The Commission's reasons for denial are:

- *The original 2-over-1 and other multi-lite wood windows proposed for removal were historic and distinctive character-defining features that contributed substantially to the historic character of the property. No documentation establishing that the condition of the original wood windows were beyond repair was submitted or available; indeed, the previous professionally prepared application for the property proposed their preservation and rehabilitation, which was the correct treatment.*
- *The replacement of the original wood windows with 1-over-1 vinyl-clad windows with different profiles, muntin patterns, trim boards, and expression is not compatible with the historic character of the property and/or the district.*
- *The proposed dormers are too large and have conjectural gabled roof lines inconsistent with the established historic character of the property, which features a modest-sized historic hip-roofed dormer. Historically, and in this district, dormers were designed to admit additional light into top stories and historically featured compatible windows, none of them sliders.*
- *The eaves of the new dormers, as compared with the building’s existing wide eaves, are exceedingly narrow and incompatible with the property’s historic character. Cladding eave soffits and/or fascias in artificial siding or with modern materials introduces an incompatible material and expression, when true wood soffits and fascia boards are a reasonable and compatible treatment.*
- *The cladding, and re-cladding of all the dormers with artificial imitation “wood grain” shakes introduces incompatible modern detailing, products, sheens, and colors. True historic wood shakes are widely available, a*

reasonable treatment, and will give a traditional mitered expression at corners.

- *Sliding windows are not compatible with buildings of this age, and incompatible with the historic character of the property and district.*
- *The proposed French door uses between-the-glass grids rather than true or simulated divided lites.*

Therefore, this work fails to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, specifically Standards:

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

(3) Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

(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.

(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.

The application may be resubmitted for the Historic District Commission's review when suggested changes have been made that address the cited reasons for denial, if applicable. Please be advised that, in accordance with MCL 399.211 and Section 21-2-81 of the 2019 Detroit City Code, an applicant aggrieved by a decision of the DHDC may file an appeal with the State Historic Preservation Review Board. Within sixty (60) days of your receipt of this notice, an appeal may be filed with:

Jon Stuckey, Michigan Department of Attorney General 2nd
Floor, G. Mennen Williams Building
525 West Ottawa Street, P.O. Box 30754, Lansing, MI 48909 Phone:
517-335-0665 E-mail: stuckeyj@michigan.gov

If you have any questions regarding the foregoing, please contact staff at 313-224-1762 or hdc@detroitmi.gov.

For the For the Commission:



Daniel Rieden, Senior Clerk to the Historic District Commission

PSR:241113GL