

From: [Peter McGreevy](#)
To: [Historic District Commission \(Staff\)](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Stone Curb Replacement in Historic Districts
Date: Wednesday, April 14, 2021 5:05:37 PM

Dear HDC Commissioners,

If I understand correctly the materials you will be considering at your April 14 meeting, I write to you today to urge you to not vote in favor of the proposed resolution language that you are being presented with this evening. While I can appreciate DTE's effort to offer a solution, I remain deeply concerned about what constitutes "not technically or economically feasible". When the City or the US Department of the Interior declares a building or area a Historic Landmark/District they are recognizing and establishing the architectural significance of the buildings and their surrounding environment. As homeowners in a historic district, we all recognize the additional financial investments that will be required to maintain and retain the historic nature of our homes and neighborhoods. We are required to take extra steps and additional measures when making repairs to our homes. Accordingly, the City must recognize that it has an additional requirement it must bear when making repairs and improvements to the infrastructure that is in line and commensurate with that of the homeowners. As such, this requirement is passed along to the various contractors that the City engages as it sources and awards contracts.

With the language proposed in the resolution, I fear it will become far too convenient and common for the City's contractors to say that it is too difficult and "not technically feasible" to take reasonable measures to remove, retain, securely store and properly reinstall historically built and architecturally significant elements during construction projects. The proposed language change creates a concerning slippery slope that will often be open to misinterpretation. I further believe that it will always be argued that projects are "not economically feasible" however, based on personal experience in maintaining and repairing our 113 year old home, this is not always the case. Cost is often a far too easy excuse to not take the extra step or take the time to find a contractor and approach that maintains historical integrity and does not break the bank.

By maintaining the original language, which has served the historic districts and the City well for the past several decades, I believe it will continue to serve the interests of the City and the historic Districts. What it may require is different sourcing criteria and processes for certain infrastructure work in the City's various historic districts. I do not feel that this is an undue burden or is insurmountable, rather, I would argue that the work to preserve these historically relevant materials in most instances is technically feasible and it does not always require a significantly higher economic investment. What is required is ingenuity and using a modified approach so that the areas in the City that have been determined at a Local, State and Federal as historically significant and relevant can maintain their original and unique character and continue to describe from where the great city of Detroit started its journey.

I respectfully request that you do not approve DTE's COA for the curb work described in Indian Village and I recommend that the proposed language is rejected.

Sincerely,

Peter McGreevy

1038 Burns

ATTENTION: This email was sent from an external source. Please be extra cautious when opening attachments or clicking links.