PLANNING AND
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Coleman A. Young Municipal Center
2 Woodward Avenue, Suite 808
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Phone 313•224•1339
www.detroitmi.gov

SR-2 – ADVISORY STAFF REPORT (06-05-2026)
This advisory report, prepared by staff, represents the opinion and advice of professional staff, and does not represent nor direct the separate review and decision of the Historic District Commission. This report serves as an addendum to SR-1, an objective staff summary of the proposal and property.

ADDRESS: 2204 SEMINOLE
MEETING DATE: 06-10-2026
APPLICATION NUMBER: HDC2026-00199

ADVISORY STAFF REPORT PREPARED BY: E. THACKERY

STAFF OBJECTIONS TO APPROVAL:
This first section describes itemized conclusions/concerns, which, in staff's professional opinion, would prevent the issue of an unconditional Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). "None" means staff has no objections and believes a COA is warranted, with no conditions. The Historic District Commission is not required to accept staff opinions or recommendations.

1. The historic windows in the south dormer are distinctively character-defining and not demonstrated to be beyond repair.

STAFF ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION:
This second section expands on the reasoning and analysis leading to staff's conclusions given in the first section above. The Historic District Commission is not required to accept staff opinions or recommendations.

- The first scope item is to demolish the house's north dormer, and then rebuild the north dormer to match the size of the south dormer.



Photo 1. The circled dormer is the north dormer, proposed for demolition and rebuilding to match the larger dormer on the opposite (south) side of the house. It is evident that the north dormer does not project as far outward from the roof as the south dormer does. (Staff photo, May 2026)



Photo 2. The north dormer in detail. This dormer exhibits replacement materials, including the square, flat trim, the casement windows without muntins, and the vertical siding on the walls. (Staff photo, May 2026)

- The existing north dormer projects 4 1/2 feet from the roof. The south dormer projects 9 feet, 7 inches from the roof. The goal is to rebuild the north dormer to match the size of the south dormer.
- The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (the "Standards") require

that historic materials and features be preserved whenever possible. They require that historic materials be repaired before replacement is considered. In the case of this north dormer, however, there is almost no historic integrity remaining. The trim around the window is not historic, the casement windows lack muntins, and the siding on the dormer is contemporary, vertical siding.
    - While the materials of the north dormer are not historic and character defining, the existence of a shed-roof dormer in that location is important to the property's historic character. Because there is no historic material evident, staff has no objection to the demolition of this dormer, as long as a dormer will be rebuilt that is compatible with the house.
- The second scope item is work on all three dormers—the newly enlarged one and the two other existing east and south dormers. Proposed is to install aluminum-clad wood casement windows with muntins, install wood trim to match the house, and finish the dormer walls with stucco after removing the contemporary vertical siding.
    - Proposed window replacements
        - The south dormer still has its historic wood casement windows with muntins, so it is clear how the windows would have historically appeared in the other dormers as well.



Photo 3. Shown is the south dormer with its original, historic casement windows with muntins. (From applicant's materials)



Photo 4. Detail of the south dormer's historic casement window. (From applicant's materials)

- The Standards require that historic materials are repaired rather than replaced when possible. Because the south dormer retains its historic, distinctive, character-defining wood windows, it is staff's opinion that the historic wood casement windows should be repaired if at all possible instead of being replaced. If the historic windows are truly beyond repair, the proposed replacements would be compatible in staff's opinion because they match the old in design, color, texture, configuration, operation, and proportion, and the substitute material of the aluminum cladding is compatible with the wood. First, however, the historic wood windows in the south dormer should be assessed for restoration.
- Proposed for the north and east dormers are wood casement windows with black aluminum cladding with muntins that approximate the south dormer windows. Since the north dormer casement windows will be the same size as those in the south dormer, the north dormer casements will match the south with six lights each. The east dormer's windows are nonhistoric vinyl double-hungs; staff does not object to their removal. The east dormer is wider and not as tall as the north and south; as a result, the windows proposed here have four lights. Staff finds that these proposed casement windows for the north and east dormers meet the Standards and the Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings in that the proposed windows in the north and east dormers are restoring a missing historic feature based on similar historic features on

this house, and the proposed windows match the historic in design, color, texture, configuration, operation, and proportion, and the substitute material of the aluminum cladding is compatible with the wood.



Photo 5. Rendering of proposed north dormer with stucco siding and replacement windows, from applicant's materials.



Photo 6. The nonhistoric vinyl double-hung windows currently in place in the east dormer, to be replaced with aluminum-clad wood casements with muntins to more closely match the historic window in the south dormer. (From the application materials)



Photo 7. Rendering of the new proposed windows in place in the east dormer, from the application materials. The windows in this dormer are smaller than those in the south dormer, so there are fewer proposed lights to maintain proportion.

        - Additionally, staff finds that the proposed windows follow the district's Elements of Design, specifically #3 and #15. Element of Design #3 ("Proportion of openings within the façade") states that, "Window openings are always subdivided..." and #15 ("Scale of facades and façade elements") states, "Window sashes are usually subdivided by muntins, which affect the apparent scale of the windows within the façades."
    - Staff finds that using wood trim on the dormers that matches historic wood trim elsewhere on the house (in material, dimension, and craftsmanship) also meets the Standards and Guidelines because it is restoring a missing historic feature based on similar historic features elsewhere on this house.
    - Proposed is finishing the side walls of all three dormers in stucco to match the rest of the house. (The south and east dormers are currently sided with contemporary vertical siding—a nonhistoric material—which is proposed to be removed. Because it is not historic, staff has no objection to this removal.)
        - Historic dormers sometimes match the body of the house (in this case, stucco), and in other cases, historic dormers are sided sometimes with slate, sometimes with materials to match the roof, and sometimes with wood siding like cedar shingles or clapboard. Element of Design #7 ("Relationship of materials") for this district states, "The majority of the buildings are faced with brick, while many are partially or totally stucco. There are some stone buildings; clapboard is rare, and almost never the sole material. Wood shingle is occasionally used as a wall covering, usually at the second floor level, and never as the sole material." Element of Design #10 ("Relationship of architectural details") states, "Details on Mediterranean style or vernacular buildings are often done in stone, brick, tile, and sometimes in stucco. They include arched windows, door openings, and porches."
        - The 1980 designation photo for this house shows the dormers being dark like the roof, so their walls are likely sided with wood siding and not stucco at the time of designation.



Photo 8. Designation slide for 2204 Seminole, 1980. (PDD files)



Photo 9. Detail of the designation slide above.

- This house's low-pitched, hipped roof with broadly overhanging eaves are identifying features of the house's Mediterranean/Italian Renaissance-inspired architectural style. The house's dark roof and overhang lends a strong horizontal emphasis. Staff is concerned that re-siding the dormer walls on this house with a light-colored stucco instead of a siding that would be painted or stained to more closely match the color of the roof would create a contrast with the dark roof, drawing attention to a feature that was intended to blend in. There is a similarly shaped brick house on Burns that also has a side-facing dormer, and that dormer's walls match the roof. There are a couple somewhat similar stucco houses in the neighborhood that have dormer walls that match the body of the house instead of the roof, but those dormers tend to be forward-facing, or in one case of a very similar house on Burns, the contrast between the body of the house and the roof is not as stark (a brownish stucco against a black or charcoal roof). It is staff's opinion that the house's horizontal emphasis would be better served with dark, side-facing dormer walls instead of light-colored ones as proposed, but there are some examples in the neighborhood of a somewhat similar treatment as proposed and staff would not characterize the proposed treatment as demonstrably inappropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
This third and final section takes staff's itemized "objections" identified in the first section, and presents them in the form of "conditions" in support of a proposed approval recommendation or "reasons" in support of a proposed denial recommendation, in the form required by Section 21-2-78 of the City Code. The Historic District Commission is not required to accept staff opinions or recommendations.

Section 21-2-78, Determinations of Historic District Commission

Recommendation 1 of 1, Certificate of Appropriateness
Staff recommends that the proposed work will be appropriate according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Indian Village Historic District's Elements of Design, with the condition that:

1. The historic, character-defining windows in the south dormer will be repaired and preserved instead of replaced.