

CITY OF HUNTINGTON WOODS
REGULAR MEETING OF THE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES

September 7, 2022

7:30 p.m.

In Person Meeting – Huntington Woods Commission Room

Commissioner Chris Vogelheim called the Meeting to order at 7:31 p.m

PRESENT: Steve Behrmann, Jeffrey Abt, Chris Vogelheim, Jeff Jenks, Michal Burshtein, Mark Fink, Robert Lebow

City Staff Present: Zoning Administrator, Hank Berry.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Spelling of Michal to be corrected for August 3rd, 2022.

Jeffrey Abt moves that minutes be accepted as corrected, Michal Burshtein seconds.

Ayes: Jeff Jenks, Mark Fink, Michal Burshtein, Jeffrey Abt, Chris Vogelheim, Robert Lebow, Steve Behrman.

None opposed and no abstention.

Approval of minutes from the special meeting on August 24th is called.

Jeffrey Abt: It looks to me as though there is a section missing. Where the questions and answers end before the motions, we had a fairly lengthy conversation about various matters. I had a question about metal fillers and the possibility of adding a second return. I think Chris had a question about how the metal covering slotted into the new windows. It seems to me that the conversation went about three times as long as what we are showing.

Hank Berry: I can check back with the minutes taker, although we are getting a new minutes taker because this one is no longer available... What I would suggest is that you defer these minutes until the next meeting and see if we can't get some more added into that. Typically what they've been doing is they've been doing it pretty much verbatim. Which has been really good specifically for a historic meeting; It took a long time to get that. Let's see if we can't do a little better on that... (Inaudible)

Chris Vogelheim: I just think it was important because it did sort of show that in the absence of detailed installation details but it did show that the exposure was similar. I think that would be appropriate. So I guess we need a motion to defer to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Would somebody please make that motion?

Robert Lebow: I motion to defer the approval of minutes until the next meeting...

Jeff Jenks: Second.

Chris Vogelheim: All in favor please say aye.

Ayes: Jeff Jenks, Mark Fink, Michal Burshtein, Jeffrey Abt, Chris Vogelheim, Robert Lebow, Steve Behrman.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Matter of a Review for a new Lanai/ addition to the Lipton residence at 26330 Hendrie.

Chris Vogelheim: Moving right along here let's move right into our applications... This is for an application for the Lipton residence at 26330 Hendrie. I see that Mr. Heller is here, so just a favor. The way this works, there's a little rogers rules of order, but everybody on the applicants side I would love it if you'd like to speak. Please do so during that first part, just remember that when you step up to the microphone just please state your name. If you live in Huntington woods an address would be appropriate too.

Hank Berry: One other point to with that is. Just for the benefit of our audio visual consultant in the back, if you don't speak into a microphone or if you move away from a microphone nobody will hear you and that will not show up on the minutes. So it will be very important to speak into the Microphone. Ben you can sit down... Yeah, you can sit there with that.

Ellen Lipton: Well good evening all of you, my name is Ellen Lipton. I am one of the applicants along with my Husband Mark. We are residents at 26330 Hendrie. Little note, Chris and I, we served on the precursor when it was the zoning board of appeals before there was the historic; So, it's nice to see you... Steve and I are also neighbors on Hendrie so it's nice to also see my good friend commissioner Jenks. So thank you all, and we look forward to answering any questions you may have.

Ben Heller: Thank you for your time tonight. My name is Ben Heller, and I have designed and worked with the Liptons to come up with an addition to the home. We have tried to be really sensitive to the historical aspects of the home and just the entire historical area. Which is something that I've always been really conscious of and tried to make a positive impact on all of the projects that we touch in Huntington Woods.

(Ben Heller distributes a rendering to accompany the plans the board already has)

(Inaudible)

... So basically the landscaping you can see in the picture that's all existing, it was a project that was done several years ago and they used Fond du lac limestone on the rise and it's all bluestone; Which is two of the materials that we were planning on matching. We were gonna use the stone on the chimney, not to duplicate the chimney that's historical to leave that let it be, and this will blend real nicely but still differentiate itself and blend nicely. And then the rest of the walls you can see from the rendering are, not walls, there's very little walls. Just minimal and it's brick and it's very similar to the addition that was built in either 2007 or 2006. That would be the family room off the kitchen and a family room off the rear of the house, that we're kind of picking up on those details. Both are not historical, but

we, just in terms of just placing the addition, everything that we're doing here meets all the ordinances in terms of set back and square footages and lot coverage. So we're totally complying with all of that, but we really tried to pay attention to putting the addition 100% in the rear of the property. So we are proposing to make no alterations to the sides or to the front of the home, zero. And to none of the other of the existing home, I mean this is an addition. If it were ever removed it could come right off and the house would be just like it is. I know that's an important aspect of the criteria with the secretary of the interior standard for the historical preservation. So we purposely designed it that way so it could just totally come off and it would be fine. If that were the case in the future, it's a very light addition in terms of its just openness. That's really what we're just trying to do. I think we all learned through Covid that we spend more time in our home, and wanting to be a part of nature a little bit more, and to be within the ordinances but to add something onto your home where you can have furniture that wouldn't get wet outside and a room that you can enjoy three seasons of the year. So that was the marching order for what we were trying to do, and I think we've kind of accomplished that. We altered the pitch purposely to not match any of the pitches on the house. Again you can see the entire wall of the addition steps in from the back of the garage, which by the way is not historical, it was added at some point but we did step it in from that. So everything we attached to is actually a previously added, I think, addition to the home. Again really the thing about not altering any of the house and not differentiating it by breaking the wall, breaking the roof pitch lines, but also allowing it to tie in and look handsome and be something that still looks like it has some balance to it without being part of the historical house. With that I would turn it over for any questions.

Chris Vogelheim: Thank you very much for your presentation. We appreciate the rendering. Hank?

Hank Berry: Basically what I'll do is I'll go through the secretary of the interiors guidelines and just have a couple comments. Again those are certainly all open for discussion from the folks and Mr. Heller certainly can answer any questions you might have, as will I. Basically the house is a rear porch or Lanai located in the rear of the structure on the northeast corner. It's not visible from the front, so you cannot see this. But it is visible from the back, but he's lowered the roof, lowered

the roof pitch, changed material on the chimney so that there's a differentiation between that. When you go to the standards it says, "The property shall be used for its historic purpose or to be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and it's site and environment," the use is still single family residential, there is no change there. So that's one of the things that you want to take into consideration. Two, "The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided." You would have to determine if this alters the historic character of the structure. Again Mr. Heller articulated that he's not attached to any part of the structure that is in fact historic. So these were additions that were added within the last 25 years or so, I'm going to go with, and that's going to be a conversation that you may want to have amongst yourselves because what is there that it's attached to does not meet the 50 year criteria for it to become historic in it's own right. Three, "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 architectural features or architectural elements from other buildings should not be undertaken." Again this should not be applied to additions, because additions are clearly allowed. So the issue then becomes, are you destroying some of the material? Well where you attach the building you are, in fact, taking some material out or you can't attach to the building. The additions part which I've included there for your review, it recommends locating exterior addition at the rear or inconspicuous side of the building. The addition should be smaller in size than the historic building to which it is attached, this is. The height of the addition should not exceed the height of the historic building, this does not. The pitch of the new roof should duplicate pitches used on the historic building. This is different, the purpose of that is he's got non-contributing parts of this resource in between his proposed addition and the original resource. The facade proportions ratio, width to height, would be similar to the historic building. This I would say meets, of course you're open to discuss it, based on the fact that it's gone down in size and it's becoming a less conspicuous portion of the back of the house. Mr. Heller does have his rendering up for you to take a look at, and I can put it up here. There's the back portion of the house and you can see where the chimney is and to the right of the chimney is what we're looking at. So we're looking at a fairly small part of the house. The addition should be set back from the existing wall

plane a minimum of 24 inches to differentiate the addition from the historic building, however, this dimension may be reviewed on a case by case basis. From the side of the garage and slight step in from the storage part of the structure this meets and again it's not visible from the street, there is a step it may not be exactly 24 inches but there is a differentiation in the wall plane between the two structures. Then the materials, "Materials should be limited to those used on the historic building or compatible with those used on the historic building. When more than one material is used on the same facade they should be used in a similar manner consistent with the manner in which the materials were originally used. Brick, wood, and stucco are frequently used materials. Vinyl, aluminum, and cement board and other contemporary man made materials are not recommended. Again Mr. Heller is matching the stone from the patio addition that was put on years and years ago. So he's bringing that element in and there's a brick element which does tie the new in with the old and gives it some historic character but the stone that is on the chimney and around it do give it the feel of the matching the newer materials that are on there. So again, "The materials of the new foundation wall should match the foundation walls of the historic building. Where using matching materials is impractical substitutions which are not obtrusive should be used," and again he's got brick, brick roll locks, slab on the top of that, and his materials are not going to be obtrusive. They're going to be materials that are found elsewhere on the property. (*Inaudible comment from off camera, sounds like "blue stone, floor"*) So the blue stone that he has there is going to be the floor in the addition. It's all tied in as far as that goes... Then it says, "Where the addition need not duplicate the exact form, style, detailing of the historic building, attention should be paid to the following details: window hoods and lintels," and again Mr. Heller can address that. Window styles, it's open. So there is no window style to worry about. "Entrance and torches," again you do have steps coming out of that but it's not like it's an entrance to the house. It's an entrance to the porch and there is an entrance to the house but the entryway to the house, and Mr. Heller can speak to this, there always was an entry to the house there. "Brickwork with coins, corbels, and other details," he didn't have any right there but there are roll locks that he has used. Columns, pilasters, and again the chimneys which we've discussed already. "Two, the addition should be constructed so there is the least possible loss of historic and so the character defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed." As far as obscuring goes, pretty much the entire addition or the entire

Lanai is open. So everything that is on the back wall except for the tie-in areas is visible from the back for the most part. And then, “Door and window height to width ratio should respect the historic building. The percentage of glass to wall should approximate that of the historic building. Each elevation should have at least one window.” Each elevation has an opening there is no glass as you can see on the rendering, it’s just open to the public. I mean the wind in the air will go right through that type of thing. So that would meet that. As far as that loss of historic materials, you’re going to lose material at the attachment point, correct me if I’m wrong Mr. Heller.

Ben Heller: Say it again, sorry.

Hank Berry: You’re going to lose materials at the attachment points where this goes.

Ben Heller: Yep, just the one opening. This is an addition that we actually built for them in ’06. So we built both those additions around that time. And yeah, so there’s just one opening there that ties into here. We had historical, a sight plan I think it was. It was sight plan back then. But yeah, and so that’s all that’s coming off. There also was an addition to the garage, was an addition at one point, it was in ’08. So there was historical for that one. And that’s actually this gable you see here in the rendering, as well as the entire garage structure that has their master bedroom above it which is all allowable, no variances. Went through historical got approved. This addition attaches to this room added in ’02 and attaches to the back of the garage added in around ’10. And so we’re keeping the garage just like it is. There are some kind of unattractive doors on the back of the garage now which are just now going to be inside that room that are going to be closed, you know, there’s a brick wall inside their space. So other than that we’re really not altering the house at all, and that was our intention. They love the house how it is, and also it fit well because it’s part of the guideline of the secretary of the interior is to make sure if this things was ever removed that hey, the house looks just like nothing was affected. That’s what we have in this case.

Hank Berry: Then going on to standard forwards, “As most properties change over time those changes have acquired historic significance in their own right shall

be retained and preserved,” typically that applies to the 50-year rule which is not anywhere close to this as you can see the dates that’s being discussed here. And again the area that this is being attached to is part of the existing structure and nowhere that this is attached to is part of the original house. Five, “Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the property shall be preserved.” The affected surfaces would be the roof, the rear wall, door, and window. Mr Heller has already articulated the plan for that. Six, “Deteriorated historic shall be repaired rather than replaced,” and it goes on about the replacement and the severity of deterioration, but as an addition this would not apply except for the documentation of the elevation that this effects. So basically at that point in time we would like to have some documentation: photographic evidence of how it looks now so that should it be approved there will be a physical record that could go on to the bsna software which is now where we’re trying to put everything. So that there will be records of it long after we’re all done with our respective positions. Seven, “Chemical or physical treatment such as sandblasting that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used,” this does not apply. There are no plans or there is nothing where that would be advantageous. And then eight, “Significant archeological resources affected by the project shall be protected and preserved.” There’s no indication that there’s going to be any archeological discoveries during the course of this. Then nine, “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 Mr Heller has articulated how he’s done that and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. So again this would be an addition and could also be considered an exterior alteration. Standard 10 would go on to say that, “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.” As the wall this is being added to is the same configuration if removed this could be restored although I can’t imagine why this would ever happen. Typically people don’t take additions off their houses once they put them on unless they fail for any reason... I have gone ahead and I put the standards, and attached them for your purview and if you have any questions I am certainly happy to answer them as I’m sure Mr. Heller is or the Liptons. Thank you.

Chris Vogelheim: Thanks Hank for the thorough report. We appreciate that. I can't remember where I started last time so I'm going to pick on Steve today to start with. Do you have any comments? Oh excuse me, my apologies. I forgot, at this point in time we're supposed to open for public participation. Seeing none, we didn't get any letters in support or anything like that I'm supposed to acknowledge Hank?

Hank Berry: We did not. We had a phone call that asked about it without identifying themselves but they did not indicate that there was anything detrimental or anything that concerned them with this project:

Ben Heller: I could add the Liptons, out of respect to the neighbors went to the Barons on one side and the other neighbors on the other side, shared the plans and did get full support from both neighbors that they support the project.

Chris Vogelheim: I corrected a bad correction, I did go out of order. My apologies, Steve you are on.

Steve Behrmann: I have no questions.

Chris Vogelheim: Thank you. Robert?

Robert Lebow: One question. Is this, for the chimney, actual stone? Or is that stone veneer?

Ben Heller: It would be real. We want to make a real masonry fireplace with fire brick and no prefab metal box, none of that crap. It'll be a real clay flue and yes it's real stone. So it matches, Zaremba did a really beautiful landscape project there several years ago and they used a stone we can still get and we're going to match it. So it's going to look very integral.

Robert Lebow: That was my only question.

Jeffrey Abt: Um, this is just really a matter of clarification. When you look at the house, from the back. On the first floor is there anything there that is part of the original house that is visible or is all of that addition?

Mr. Lipton: Do you want me to answer that?

Jeffrey Abt: This is really, I'm talking about the first floor now, not the second.

Mr. Lipton: So going from this side. From this side across, that's new. This is a walk out door that used to be a window so that wall was there. This wall used to be a walk out door but now it's a window. So they kind of got switched.

Jeffrey Abt: But, well, that's the question. So that was, at some point, what you're pointing to right now was added to the original house?

Mr. Lipton: Yeah, well we added this. We altered that. This was added by previous people. So basically none of it is the same.

Ben Heller: I will say the front that is where it's really what it was. That entire (inaudible) and a half front that the house has. Those dormers in the front, and the beautiful brick entryway and curved walls. Wood header, that's all original.

Mr Lipton: The only change, if you remember, this house used to have one garage. Redfield house. ONE garage on the left side and that garage was two cars deep. If you're looking at the house that was on the right. That got moved now it was set back. So that's now flat and across and then the rest of them from that point. If you're looking from the right to the left that's all original until you get to the new garage on the far left. Which I think the Redfieldsthey added, and then we did the above.

Jeffrey Abt: Um, so, and also this is just for the record. That, um, the exposed walls I believe on the wall facing north and the wall facing east. Those are all additions, that brick, that will be exposed. That the Lanai is being built... nope, from the back. So if I'm reading the plan correctly um, in creating the Lanai. It's backing on two sides of the wall it's going to form.

(Inaudible reference to example)

Ben Heller: You can see the room on the right, behind the kitchen and the room you were just pointing at that we're connecting to were added at the same time. There was nothing when we did the addition in '02. Then the garage with that room behind it, the garage was there. We added that little storage space because it was allowable staying within the garage allowable space. Therefore everything we're attaching to, is added space.

Jeffrey Abt: Okay, that's it for me.

Michal Burshtein: I don't have any questions.

Mark Fink: No questions.

Jeff Jenks: On sort of the columns that frames are open windows. Those will match what looks like that back? Because you had sort of indicated in laying out that it was siding and I just get real...

Ben Heller: To answer that question, if we did say something like that it was not intentional. That all the exterior facade of our (Inaudible). That is something that we're going to duplicate. (Inaudible) We just determined that aesthetically they blend better. If someone were to get a glimpse on the side it certainly would look more like what you guys would want to see.

Jeff Jenks: I'd like to move to accept this.

Chris Vogelheim: So obviously we're closing the discussion and we're going to do a little deliberations but so there has been a motion put forth. So we can either discuss that motion.

Jeff Jenks: I'll withdraw.

Chris Vogelheim: Withdraw? Ok, fine. Either way we're looking for a motion, then we'll have a discussion for said motion. If not then I'm gonna entertain that

motion again and then we can have some discussion about it. Is there a second to Mr. Jenks?

Steve Behrmann: I would think that we might want to reference the guidelines that the project would fall under.

Chris Vogelheim: I would agree.

Steve Behrmann: I would offer an amendment unless Jeff wants to. In the guidelines I see a one, two, three, four, five, nine and ten.

Chris Vogelheim: I would just make a slight amendment that I would probably pull four because I don't think the additions to the historic property have historic merit in their own right.

Hank Berry: At this time typically they would not qualify.

Chris Vogelheim; So it would be one, two, three, five, nine, ten, I believe.

*Chris Vogelheim motions to approve based on compliance with standards one, two three, five, nine and ten. Jeffrey Abt seconds the motion.

Ayes: Jeff Jenks, Mark Fink, Michal Burshtein, Jeffrey Abt, Chris Vogelheim, Robert Lebow, Steve Behrman.

None opposed and no abstention.

OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Administrative Approvals

Berry: Administrative approvals are a part of Public Act 169 of 1970 is amended which allows for the historic district commission to give staff a reasonable amount of approvals or items for things that happen on a fairly regular and predictable

basis so as not to inconvenience people with simple adjustments to their house, or simple replacements that border on maintenance or need.

Berry then shares a powerpoint explaining each item on the Administrative Approvals powerpoint presentation. The slides read as follows:

1. Gutter and downspout (and related accessories) replacement with the same materials and like size and style. The recommendation is to leave it as is.
2. Open metal fences, such as chain link and wrought iron that comply with the Chapter 6 of the City Code. Recommended changes are: to add aluminum, in typical wrought iron style and patterns. Change Chapter 6 language to Chapter 40-10.10
3. Driveway and walkway replacement provided that routing and materials are not changing. Recommendation: Leave as is.
4. Replacement of uncovered porches with same or like materials and of the same size or style. Recommendation: Leave as is.
5. Painting, where brick or masonry is not being painted the first time. Recommendation: Leave as is.
6. Re-roofing where the material is being replaced with the same or like material, and same shingle style, or go back to original as substantiated. Recommendation: Leave as is.
7. Shutters when matching existing in size, design, configuration and materials. Recommendation: Leave as is.
8. Window and storm replacement when done with the same pattern, size and scale. Most of the time, all windows go to the full HDC. Recommendations: a) leave as is b) explore whether same dimension clad windows count can be included in this with demonstration of severe deterioration, or c) define TDL/SDL as they can be the same pattern but cannot be the same thing.
9. Hot tubs, pools where not visible from the street providing no trees are disturbed. Recommendation: This falls under the same as decks and patios. If it isn't visible from the street, there shouldn't be an issue.
10. Ornamental iron replacement with the same pattern, size, material and scale. Recommendation: Define what happens when documentation is not available, missing, or lost.
11. Replacement of light fixtures provided they are not a character defining feature of the resources. Recommendation: a) define whether that includes

front, sides and back b) define whether it includes both districts c) exclude fire hazard and broken fixtures from HDC review.

12. Excavation for water or sewer line replacement. Recommendation: Continue any and all below grade staff approvals or change language to reflect all.
13. Decks and rear yard patios. This is not visible from the street and has no effect on the streetscape. Recommendation: Continue staff approvals
14. Basement egress windows in the side or the rear of the building. This is consistent with code and change is not recommended.
15. Air conditioners and generators in the side yard with neighbors approval. This is consistent with code and change is not recommended.
16. Tree removal when diseased or dead. This is not something that comes up often and we get confirmation from an arborist or DPW depending on how obvious it is. We haven't done this in a while and this only applies to private trees. Recommendation: specifically denote private trees and/or add the verbiage dying to match code.

Hill Vs. Rackham administrative approvals

- a. Require differentiation?
- b. Limit to building?
- c. Cell tower
- d. Fencing

Lebow: I have a verbiage question, specifically for Mark. Frequently we come across the work "like" to me that's so nebulous it could be almost anything. Is there another word that we could use or construct?

Fink: Not that I know of. I think you know the word is inherently ambiguous.

Berry: What it would mean to me if somebody was bringing it in, it would be like. Like doesn't mean taking a wrought iron light fixture with wavy glass on the inside of it and swapping it out for a mason jar outside light. Like would be a similar material. If you're taking out a wrought iron light fixture, you're replacing it with a wrought iron fixture. It would not be swapping out fixtures of different sizes and fixtures.

Lebow: I think that is a discussion we should have. What is like and how can we tighten that up?

Berry: you can always change it to say of the same size, of the same material, etc and then you take like out of the equation all together. My suggestion is to send me your thoughts, and I can put together a list for you. I would ask that you pay close attention to the differentiation between the hill district and the rackham district. I think this is a good way to start. One last thing that I have and then I'll stop talking is that it looks like we're going to get our historic marker for this spring. We have agreed with the city of Detroit to have it located in a very prominent location on the center island as you pull in and pull around in front of the golf course so everyone can see it.

Chris Vogelheim opened and closed the meeting for public participation as there was none.

ADJOURNMENT:

Moved by Jeffrey Abt and seconded by Chris Vogelheim to adjourn the meeting of the Historic District Commission

Ayes: Jeff Jenks, Michael Burshtein, Jeffrey Abt, Chris Vogelheim, Mark Fink
Steve Behrmann, Robert Lebow

Nays: None

Absent: None

The Motion Carried, meeting adjourned at 8:51 pm.

Submitted

Lucas Rice - Recorder