

CITY OF HUNTINGTON WOODS
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
DRAFT MINUTES
January 24, 2022
7:00 p.m.
In Person Meeting – Huntington Woods Commission Room

Commissioner Mike Wright called the Meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

PRESENT: Gail Linden, Mike Wright, Rick Polan, Chris Golembiewski, Todd Sperl, Bob Paul,

ABSENT: Blake Moore (excused), Jill Ingber (Excused),

City Staff Present: Zoning Administrator, Hank Berry.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Todd Sperl and seconded by Gail Linden to approve the January 24, 2022, agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Mike Wright called for approval of the December 6, 2021, and November 26, 2021 meetings.

Berry: Asked if minutes could be approved separately due to some corrections.

Wright: Any edits to the November 26 meeting? If not, looking for a motion to approve.

Wright: Motion to approve as amended. Chris Golembiewski seconded the motion.

Ayes: Golembiewski, Paul, Linden, Polan, Wright, Kohn

Nays: None

Absent: Moore (excused), Ingber (excused)

The Motion Carried.

Commissioner Wright asked for approval of December 6 minutes.

Gail Linden: I should be listed as absent.

Linden: It says that Chase would be interested in putting another ATM on Woodward but it should say Coolidge.

Wright: Looking for approval of the December 6, 2021 Meeting Minutes as amended.

Motioned by Todd Sperl, Seconded by Gail Linden

Ayes: Golembiewski, Paul, Linden, Polan, Wright, Kohn

Nays: None

Absent: Moore (excused), Ingber (excused)

The Motion Carried.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Matter of Site Plan Review of the Greenberg/Varner Residence at 25812 Salem

Chris Morgan: My name is Chris Morgan and I am here with my client Eric Greenberg, his wife Mary is not here. We are looking at adding a master suite addition over the top of the existing kitchen area. So you can see the front elevation, there's actually a second level balcony up there and then the area to the right, is an office with a flat roof right now. We feel that the house has a nice stately look to it right now, but it looks a little asymmetrical. We want to enhance the symmetry and the stateliness of the architecture. We can look at the proposed design now.

On the left, is where we've added the master suite addition and you can see on the left side elevation too as it goes across and what we did is we added a hip roof which matches the existing roof but we kept it at the 26 foot height restriction. We also added a complimentary roof above the existing office that gave balance to the house, and symmetry to the house and we really feel like that enhances the front elevation. Our intentions are to match all of the brick detail and the brick itself, and the overhang details with the dental moldings. The windows for maintaining the symmetry and using light size and type windows and details in the windows with the muntins. The roof pitch and the roof material itself will match the house as well.

The house is zoned R1B, and we are well under the maximum allowed house size which is 3,688 sq. ft. with our lot size. Our proposed size would be 2,897 sq. ft. We are also under the maximum lot coverage of 25%, we are actually at 18.9%, but with the 530 sq. ft. set aside for accessory structures we're at 24.3%. Lastly, we do have a letter from the neighbor to the north and the east that would be directly affected by the addition, we have letters of support from both of them.

Berry: What I wanted to go over with this house, is that this house is unique. If you take a look at the way that the site plan is, the house faces Salem over here – but the house is actually platted off of Hendrie. What I am concerned about is a variance for the rear yard because our ordinance has always said straight up, straight back and it was interpreted primarily to the side yards and I interpreted to this for the rear yard as well

because it wasn't encroaching any worse. When I asked the city attorney for an opinion, they said that was fine, but we should clarify that with the ordinance so in February you will have a small language change on an ordinance coming up, but that has been interpreted and backed up to be that they're taking up no more ground floor, no more square footage over on the lot that exists currently. The height is existing and the R1B district, they're allowed 35 feet, its at 30.93, front yard is 30 feet, there's a 35.8, there's no change to that, there's no change to the side yards, and the rear yard – we have a letter from the city attorney stating that she supports my decision with that.

They are under the square footage 24.3 does include the set aside,, there was a typo from a previous write up but they would have bene under in any case. If there's any other questions you may have – this is pretty straight forward, they balance the roof line out on both sides with the center, they've added the window on the top left so it is consistent with the lower and the once next to it. If you have any questions, I am sure Mr. Morgan, or myself would be happy to answer them.

Wright: We will open it up for public discussion. Seeing none, we will close public discussion.

Paul: I don't have any questions, I like the improvements.

Kohn: The height showing near the top of the first page shows the proposed height stories 30.83 and then at the bottom, you're saying that the real height is typically viewed as 26.

Berry: The 30.83 is to the main house, which is the roof height which is not changing so that is what is listed up front. The addition comes out to 25 ft. 10 in. is that correct?

Morgan: I am keeping it at 26 ft. because I am actually flattening out that roof up there, but yeah.

Kohn: I've got no problem, this seems pretty straight forward.

Sperl: I am fine with it as well. Nice Job. It's going to look nice.

Polan: No comments or questions.

Golembiewski: No comments or questions.

Linden: It looks great. The only windows you're replacing are the two windows in the front and the two additions and those are going to be windows that match the other windows throughout?

Morgan: Yep.

Linden: Looks Great.

Motion to approve plans:

Moved by Gail Linden and seconded by Sheldon Kohn to approve the Site Plan Review for the Greenberg/Varner Residence at 25812 Salem.

Ayes: Golembiewski, Kohn, Linden, Polan, Wright, Sperl, Paul

Nays: None

Absent: Moore (excused), Ingber (excused)

The Motion Carried.

Matter of Site Plan Review of an addition to the Agnello Residence at 26675 Humber

Danaher: I am Andrew Danaher, the architect on this project. Currently the house is a rental house that Robert Agnello bought a few, maybe a year and a half ago. We began working on the house and looking at it as far as what we could do to bring his family back into Huntington Woods – they are currently residing in another house in Royal Oak. We needed a four bedroom,, two bathroom house minimum. The house sits back about an additional 20 feet than the surrounding neighbors. We were trying to figure out a way to either not rebuild the whole house, keep a good chunk of the first floor intact, not really adjust the front entryway. What we came down to was an addition on the rear so it's up and back basically. We do have a garage that sits six feet off of our rear property line which we knew was going to be a challenge, and we didn't want to connect the garage to the house, so we still maintain a sort of portal to the backyard, but the new addition comes within 3ft. 6 in. of the rear garage, so we're under the three but we know there's a 10 foot rule in Huntington Woods, accessory structure to house. We can talk about some details with that if there are some concerns, but the new addition would be all built to match the existing house. We are going to tongue and tooth in some of the brick along the peak lines if you see but we're basically turning a bungalow into a colonial, which will be similar to the southern residents which exist today. We meet all of the other rules of coverage, square footage maximums, the height maximums. The main variance we are seeking is a 3 ft. 2 in. reduction on the rear side yard, rear yard setback, but also the proximity to the existing accessory structure.

Berry: They have some unique challenges with this particular house because it does sit back. The problem you have with it is that when you put an addition on the back, they run into a bind with an existing garage – that will be sorted out at the zoning board of appeals and that's probably one of the arguments they may want to make. The space that they're adding, and the space that they're looking to add off the back of the house makes sense. They are under the maximum house height, they are under the front yard setback, the side yards are fine, the rear yard is fine, and the lot coverage is under – I had him at 28.8, and then the house size I had at 2,998 where 3,000 is permitted. This will need a variance from the zoning board of appeals. There were just a couple

clarifications on the plans that I wanted to make sure that everybody understood. Where they're showing the elevations, and they're saying west to exterior elevation, and they're showing what was there and they're showing existing – what he's actually showing you is not what's existing but what's proposed. The only question that I had is, is it down on the North exterior elevation where it says existing, and you have the hatching right in there, on the bottom of that elevation which is new there's no windows on that. So the fenestration on that side is a little bit light for what that is. You can take a look at the interior plan, and draw your conclusions or Andy can go ahead and address that if you want. I also didn't have a window schedule or sizes while some of them are drawn, you can see that they look like they might be casement windows, some are bigger and they look like they'll either be fixed or they'll be double hungs. The other thing for clarification was some have muntins and some do not. I assume the windows at the bottom are glass black – is that correct?

Danaher: Those exist today so anything that's not located or shaded and is an existing window which will likely at this point because construction costs are down a little bit, we likely will replace all the windows but he's trying to balance the cost when we started this a year and a half ago. The windows will all have muntins in the end game.

Berry: This is pretty straight forward. The only question I had was about how there was no fenestration on that one side.

Danaher: On that elevation, if it makes sense that face sits in about 10 ft. from the other, so that area tucks back. That's the side were wanting to have most of our kitchen cabinetry so that it opens up most of the view of the yard. They're replacing a pair of windows, with a pair of doors.

Wright: Opened the floor for public participation. Seeing none. Closed the floor for public participation.

Linden: I caught something on page three of the proposal of site plan review when it is comparing the properties to Humber on both sides of it, it said that the house size was going to be 2,897 but according to the plans it's 2,998 – just under the maximum house size. I think it looks fine as long as the windows get the muntin bars so that it is consistent throughout.

Golembiewski: No questions from me.

Polan: Hank, do we require a window schedule for approval?

Berry: The window schedule is – you don't need it for approval but I mean, it says all dimensions, the reason that we like to have it is because if the planning commission would have a question about are you replacing the same size windows with the same size windows, we have the information there to make that. Without it, we don't have that information.

Polan: When you made the fenestration, you made it on scaling then?

Berry: I based it on scale, correct but he didn't need that number to make the 3,000.

Sperl: No questions from me.

Kohn: I have a couple questions. If it doesn't show muttons on the windows, those windows are or are not muttoned?

Danaher: The two facing north are the upper ones are not. Based on construction costs, so we will probably replace the rest of the windows as well. We are not increasing the size of the opening, so it will be a true replacement.

Kohn: There's not much we can do about what is already installed. About the fenestration issue that Hank brought up, I understand the use that is in the room behind it but that is not something the planning commission is supposed to take into account in terms of determining the suitability of the plan, don't care what you do inside. We're concerned with the appearance of exterior and whether it's suitable. That level of expanse, that has no windows in it – that's concerning because there's nothing from the extension over to the right as we're looking at it. There's a three and a half foot dimension between the edges of the buildings. My other concern was access in terms of fire safety. Other than that, I have no particular problems.

Paul: Is there actually a door there that's not showing?

Danaher: No, the door is in the perpendicular wall where those red windows exist today and the building sits steps back almost 10 ft. there, so there's a pair of doors there with a new set of steps coming down.

Wright: My first thought was the lack of fenestration there but looking at where it is on the house, you're never going to see that. That area of the house is completely buried so I guess I'm okay with it too because of that.

Motion to approve plans as presented:

Moved by Gail Linden and seconded by Todd Sperl to approve the Site Plan Review for the Greenberg/Varner Residence at 25812 Salem.

Ayes: Golembiewski, Kohn, Linden, Polan, Wright, Sperl, Paul

Nays: None

Absent: Moore (excused), Ingber (excused)

Matter of Site Plan Review to the Lister Residence at 25870 Concord

Ostrowski: I am Michael Ostrowski, the architect, this is my associate and brother Peter. We are representing the Lister's here tonight and would like to present the

addition for approval. This residence was built in 1936 and is listed at 2,431 sq. ft. We are proposing to add to the rear of the structure in addition to an existing family room at 119 sq. ft. which will enlarge and make an awkwardly shaped space into a usable family room. We are also proposing to add an additional 199 sq. ft. to the kitchen area which will update and give higher function to the kitchen. This renovation will also provide more window surfaces and direct access to the rear yard. The existing residence has brick smooth and rock face cut limestone surrounds in detail as well as exposed painted cortisone timbers, aluminum clad eaves and soffits, bracketing and window trim. There are also prominent exposures of vinyl siding on the upper front gable, cantilevered second floor side porch, in the rear one story family room, which the outmoded vinyl siding covers all four sides. The design proposal incorporates the use of matching brick, limestone seals, and rock face cut stone detail, new metal clad insulated windows and doors standing seam metal clad bay window roofing, painted soffits, moldings and trim. Matching roof shingles, 6 in. diameter, half pound gutters, and a very judicious use of cementitious hearty plank siding, all of which are contextual and sensitively balanced. Furthermore, the proposed addition is confined to the rear of the structure and there's no exposure to the street. The proposal calls for removing the outdated, and loaded clad eaves and soffits, and trim, second floor non-egress windows, a 12 ft. by 20 ft. dilapidated aluminum awning, and 240 sq. ft. of vinyl siding. The new material specifications match the existing residents, and exclude non-performing inappropriate items including the vinyl siding. We are proposing the use of 112 sq. ft. of high performance cementitious exterior wall clay on the second floor only, which reduces the use of existing use of vinyl cladding by 64%. We feel that the minimal use of siding maintains the integrity of the existing design characteristics of the residence. The front gable and the protruding upper side torch are prime examples. They are both clad with vinyl siding and are strikingly conspicuous. These features will hopefully be re-clad with the contextually appropriate high performance material. The proposed use and placement of the siding and the residence is proper, subtle and suitably located on the second floor and allows for the appropriate use of this material for future upgrades to this outstanding home. Photos which display the materials, details and finishes of the addition are presented as evidence.

They are the garage which was designed, approved and constructed on this site last summer. We are asking for your vote of confidence and approval to our design proposal so we may continue with the next phase of the Lister's project.

Wright: Thank you. Hank do you have anything to add?

Berry: You're looking at this elevation, which is the rear elevation since Mr. Ostrowski is taking the time to provide us with this. You're looking at a change in materials, which is a material upgrade. Additionally, the siding that is on the second story is a balance issue and it provides some architectural relief and it also provides a lessening of massing from the other sides. In this case it's not really so much of a problem, you also take a look at the soldier coursing and the brick detail that Mr. Ostrowski had included on this along with the lighting and the porch balusters and everything, it really does

look nice. The details are replicated all the way around on the north side elevation. It changes the look in a nice way.

Hank showed pictures of the current house and explained what it would look like on the existing structure.

Berry: No variances needed. I'd like to thank Mr. Ostrowski for so much attention to detail. I want to note that we do have communication from a neighbor who is unhappy with the garage that was approved and built last year. I will make this available for the record and it will be incorporated into the record. If there are any other questions, I will be happy to answer them.

Wright: The floor is open for public participation. Seeing none. Closed for public participation.

Paul: Great work, great detail. I don't have any questions.

Kohn: I am fine with it as well, as far as addressing the letters from the neighbors they are appreciated but not sole determining factor.

Polan: I do have an issue with the vinyl siding staying if you're bringing hearty plank board into the back. Too many different materials on one house with no guarantee that it is ultimately going to be changed out. If I were to approve it, I would have to say that the front siding is switched out.

Ostrowski: This is typically a material that replaces that would ultimately replace that over time.

Polan: I don't have an issue with the material, I have an issue that it is creating an inconsistency around the house. I agree it is a superior product

Ostrowski: are you promoting vinyl siding on the back then?

Polan: I am not promoting vinyl siding, I'm promoting consistency. So either way to me, it has to be consistent building materials.

Ostrowski: The Hardie siding is on the garage, and we have photos of that and we can show you what it will look like. I'm pretty sure that in the future, the Lister's will address the vinyl siding on the front of the house.

Polan: I believe that the homeowners would want it consistent, I am just looking for some sort of guarantee that it will be consistent.

Berry: It's similar to the windows situation from earlier, if it is on the existing house you cannot necessarily ask them – you can ask them to change it but if Mr. Ostrowski is not in a position to give you an authorized answer that they will do that, then one of two

things can happen; he can say that he's going to ahead and put vinyl on the back for consistency, or when he has a chance to talk to the Lister's, they can just come in and use Hardie or like material on the whole project.

Ostrowski: Hank, can we show them the garage and show you that.

Hank showed pictures of the existing garage. Ostrowski explained the structure with the hardy plank siding.

Polan: It looks great, I just have an issue with the consistency.

Berry: If you can call and get the Lister's on the phone, and call for a brief recess – that would be the best course of action.

Ostrowski: I can call them right now.

Chairman Wright called for a two minute recess to call the Lister's, the homeowners on this project.

Ostrowski got the homeowner on the phone:

Berry: The planning commission had concerns about there being hardy on the back of the house and then the front part of the house having vinyl siding. Contextually, it was creating a consistency issue for some of the members of the planning commission. The question was, would you be willing to use the same hardy plank on the rest of the house as well, where there's existing siding, so there's a consistency throughout the project.

Lister: The answer is yes.

Berry: Is Mr. Ostrowski authorized to make that happen for you this evening?

Lister, Yes, correct.

Berry: Mr. Chair, are you satisfied?

Wright: Yeah, absolutely.

Golembiewski: No questions from me.

Linden: I think the plans are great. The addition is great. I am glad to see the awning go away from the old structure. Is the plank going to be dark hardy board or is it going to be a light color – out of curiosity.

Ostrowski: We are going with that rich color that is in the garage.

Motion to approve plans with the siding replacement at the front and side with the hardy board:

Moved by Rick Polan and seconded by Gail Linden to approve the Site Plan Review for the Lister Residence at 25870 Concord.

Ayes: Golembiewski, Kohn, Linden, Polan, Wright, Sperl, Paul

Nays: None

Absent: Moore (excused), Ingber (excused)

OTHER BUSINESS:

Public Hearing Ordinance Revision

Berry: There were questions on the language in the ordinance. I spoke with the city attorney, and you all were privy to the email that was sent back answering all of your questions. There is nothing else that I would have to say about it other than to talk about in the past – so I would get your feedback and public participation. Other than that I would look for a recommendation to move this out to the city commission.

Wright: We will open and close public participation as there is none.

Wright: We are looking for a motion to recommend this be pushed on to the city commission for approval.

Moved by Chris Golembiewski and seconded by Todd Sperl to approve and recommend the ordinance revision to the city commission.

Ayes: Golembiewski, Kohn, Linden, Polan, Wright, Sperl, Paul

Nays: None

Absent: Moore (excused), Ingber (excused)

Master Plan Update Discussion

Berry: We are receiving an updated copy of the master plan. They would like to do it at a separate meeting in February. They're suggesting February 17, 2022 as a date for the special meeting. If that works, we would need a motion to set the special meeting for the master plan discussion, location TBD.

Moved by Todd Sperl and seconded by Chris Golembiewski to approve a special meeting date of the planning commission to discuss the master plan update of February 17, 2022, location TBD.

Ayes: Golembiewski, Kohn, Linden, Polan, Wright, Sperl, Paul

Nays: None

Absent: Moore (excused), Ingber (excused)

Wright: Open and closed public participation as there is none.

ADJOURNMENT:

Moved by Todd Sperl and seconded by Chris Golembiewski to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting.

Ayes: Golembiewski, Kohn, Linden, Polan, Wright

Nays: None

Absent: Moore (excused), Sperl (excused), Ingber (excused)

The Motion Carried, meeting adjourned at 8:04 pm.

Submitted

Amy Berry - Recorder