

STAFF REPORT 04-15-2020 MEETING

PREPARED BY: G. LANDSBERG

APPLICATION NUMBER: 20-6663 (TABLED FROM 03-11-2020 MEETING)

ADDRESSES: 269 WINDER (4 PARCELS INCLUDING 2515 BRUSH, 269, 281, 291 WINDER)

HISTORIC DISTRICT: BRUSH PARK

APPLICANT: MHT HOUSING, INC./KEM-TEC/HAMILTON-ANDERSON

OWNER: CITY OF DETROIT (PENDING SALE TO APPLICANT)

DATE OF COMPLETE APPLICATION: 02-25-2020

DATE OF STAFF VISIT: 03-08-2020

SCOPE: ERECT A NEW MIXED-USE BUILDING

REVISED PROPOSAL

In response to HDC comments at the March meeting, the applicant has revised their proposal to erect a four-story mixed-use apartment building consisting of 58 affordable housing units (100% affordable) at Brush and Winder Streets. The building and associated parking lots will be oriented along Brush and occupy four currently vacant parcels running west along Winder.

The original March staff report is appended to this document following the revised design presentation. The applicant has also included the earlier design in juxtaposition to the revised design in their current presentation, which immediately follows this introductory page.

Per the applicant, the design has been revised in the following ways to address the Commission's concerns:

- Variation in tone, texture, and size of concrete planks applied to a simple massing continues to be the basis of design
- Additional projection at Winder/Brush corner adds planar variation
- Red tone is more prevalent, improving the desired historic neighborhood fit and palette
- Coping at building top

STAFF OBSERVATIONS AND RESEARCH

- The applicant design team has participated in several calls with HDC and PDD Design Review staff since the March meeting, resulting in the revisions presented today
- HDC staff is satisfied that the proposed revisions address the Commission's concerns within a budgetary framework appropriate for affordable housing. These include a revision of the white (lighter) colored fiber reinforced concrete panels to a more appropriate (darker) color, and a revision of the elevations to make the building less monolithic/flat.
- PDD Design Review staff has also been satisfied, and recommends that the HDC approve the revised design

ISSUES

- No further issues

RECOMMENDATION

It is staff's opinion that the revised proposal should qualify for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff recommends that the Commission approve a COA for the proposed application, as it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, especially Standard #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.

BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS

269 Winder Street, Detroit

PREPARED FOR:

CITY OF DETROIT HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION HEARING



Strategically located along the pedestrian and vehicular connector between the central business district and the Historic Brush Park residential district, the Brush Park Apartments at 269 Winder will contribute to the fabric, vibrancy, and accessibility of the neighborhood.

The building will house 58 affordable one-bedroom and studio apartment units, community rooms including a prominent ground-floor corner location, and retail space that will serve residents and neighbors.

The proposed development is uniquely positioned to anchor the Brush Park neighborhood at a critical entry point, strengthen Brush Street as a major Detroit neighborhood connector, and anchor a residential street (Winder). The project is sensitive to its historic neighbors while building on aspects of the development to the north in scale and spirit of contemporary architecture.

Material, texture, and color, as well as opening pattern, scale, and proportion have been evaluated relative to historic and contemporary Brush Park buildings. Buildability, longevity, and affordability are considerations while striving for a thoughtful and inventive solution.

269 WINDER STREET

PROJECT: BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS
CLIENT: MHT HOUSING, INC.
LOCATION: 269 WINDER, DETROIT

Scope of Work:

This project is to build a senior living building. The building will be mixed use on the first floor, with retail along Brush Street. The remainder of the first floor will be dedicated to the residential units. Parking for both retail and residents will be provided on site. The first floor will hold the offices, mechanical/utility room, the main community room and 2 ADA public restrooms. The building will be equipped with an elevator and two egress staircases.

Legal Description:

LAND SITUATED IN THE CITY OF DETROIT, COUNTY OF WAYNE, STATE OF MICHIGAN, DESCRIBED AS:

2515 BRUSH - TAX NUMBER: 01000598-604
 LOT 1, EXCEPT THE WEST 9 FEET, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

291 WINDER - TAX NUMBER: 01000597
 THE WEST 9 FEET OF LOT 2 AND THE EAST 35 FEET OF LOT 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

N. WINDER - TAX NUMBER: 01000596
 THE WEST 15 FEET OF LOT 2 AND THE EAST 1/2 OF LOT 3, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

269 WINDER - 01000595.002L
 THE WEST 1/2 OF LOT 3 AND ALL OF LOT 4, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

ALSO
 LOT 5, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

THE PERIMETER DESCRIPTION BELOW COMPRISES PARCELS 1 THROUGH 4 AND A PORTION OF PARCEL 5.

LAND IN THE CITY OF DETROIT, WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN BEING ALL OF LOTS 1 THROUGH 4 AND PART OF LOT 5 BLOCK 2 BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS; AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE WEST LINE OF BRUSH STREET (60 FEET WIDE) AND THE NORTH LINE OF WINDER STREET (60 FEET WIDE), BEING THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 1; THENCE S59°16'09"W 233.30 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF WINDER STREET; THENCE N30°24'30"W 165.88 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF A PUBLIC ALLEY (20 FEET WIDE); THENCE N59°16'09"E 242.96 FEET ALONG SAID SOUTH ALLEY LINE TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 1 AND THE WEST LINE OF BRUSH STREET; THENCE S27°04'30"E 166.22 FEET ALONG SAID WEST LINE TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING AND CONTAINING 0.907 ACRES.

PROPERTY INFO:
 LOT AREA: 39,501± SF OR 0.907 ± ACRES

BUILDING
 FLOORS: 4
 HEIGHT: _____
 BUILDING FOOTPRINT: 11,368 SF
 BUILDING SIZE: 45,631 SF

APARTMENT UNITS
 6 - STUDIO UNITS
 52 - 1 BEDROOM UNITS
 58 UNITS

USE: MIXED USE - FIRST FLOOR RETAIL & RESIDENTIAL
 SECOND TO FOURTH FLOOR RESIDENTIAL

LOT COVERAGE
 11,536/39,501 = 29%

ZONING DESIGNATION
 PD-H: PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT - HISTORICAL

"LOT DIMENSIONS, SETBACKS, HEIGHT LIMITATIONS, LOT COVERAGE PERCENTAGE AND FLOOR AREA RATIOS SHOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO THE NATURE OF THE PROJECT AND RELATE WELL TO SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT." (Sec. 50-13-122)


RESIDENTIAL DENSITY
 58 UNITS/0.29 ACRES = 200 UNITS PER ACRE

FAR
 BUILDABLE LAND AREA = 39,501 SF
 GROSS FLOOR AREA = 45,631 SF
 FAR = 45,631/39,501
 FAR = 1.16

SHEET INDEX

ARCHITECTURAL	
ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN	ASP.1
NEIGHBORHOOD SITE PLAN	ASP.2
LANDSCAPE PLAN	LP.1
FLOOR PLANS	A.1.1
ENLARGED UNIT FLOOR PLAN	A.1.2
EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS	A.2.1
EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS	A.2.2
EXTERIOR RENDERINGS	A.3.1
PHOTOMETRIC PLAN	



SURVEY	
ALTA/TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY	1



LEGEND

(Symbol)	ELECTRIC MANHOLE
(Symbol)	HAND HOLE
(Symbol)	UTILITY POLE
(Symbol)	GAS VALVE
(Symbol)	LIGHT POLE WITH STREET LAMP
(Symbol)	SANITARY MANHOLE
(Symbol)	SQUARE CATCH BASIN
(Symbol)	FIRE HYDRANT
(Symbol)	WATER GATE MANHOLE
(Symbol)	WATER VALVE
(Symbol)	STEAM VALVE
(Symbol)	LIGHTPOST/LAMP POST
(Symbol)	SINGLE POST SIGN
(Symbol)	DECIDUOUS TREE (AS NOTED)
(Symbol)	OVERHEAD UTILITY LINE
(Symbol)	GAS LINE
(Symbol)	SEWER LINE
(Symbol)	WATER LINE
(Symbol)	STEAM LINE

NOTE: ALL UTILITIES LISTED ARE EXISTING UNLESS STATED OTHERWISE.



PARKING REQUIREMENTS
 PD DISTRICT DESIGN CRITERIA
 "PARKING & LOADING, WHERE APPROPRIATE, ADEQUATE VEHICULAR OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING SHOULD BE PROVIDED. THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WILL BE GUIDED BY STANDARDS DELINEATED IN THIS CHAPTER WITH ADJUSTMENTS APPROPRIATE TO EACH SPECIFIC SITUATION." (Sec. 50-11-15 e)

PROVIDED:

OFF STREET PARKING -	29 SPACES
ON STREET PARKING* -	9± SPACES
TOTAL -	38 SPACES

ALL UTILITIES ARE TO BE PROPERLY LOCATED BY CIVIL ENGINEER FOR BUILDING PERMITS

STORM WATER RETENTION AREA WILL BE PROPERLY SIZED AND LOCATED FOR BUILDING PERMITS



ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN

NOT TO SCALE

See Full Size Sheet Also Included in the Submission

REVISION	DATE	BY	DESCRIPTION
#1	02-12-2020	M.L./A.G.	HDC - PROJECT REVIEW
#2	02-12-2020	M.L./A.G.	PPR MEETING

CLIENT: MHT HOUSING, INC.
BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS
 269 WINDER, DETROIT, MICHIGAN
 SITE AREA: 39,501± SF OR 0.907 ± ACRES

ARCHITECTURAL
 SITE PLAN



PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTS
 PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS
 4225 EASTMAN AVE
 EASTPOINTE, MI 48021
 (586)772-2222 PHONE
 (586)772-4048 FAX



APPLICANT: MHT HOUSING, INC.
 32600 TELEGRAPH RD., #102
 BIRMINGHAM, MI 48202
 PHONE: 586.833.0650

DRAWN BY: JFG
 SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"
 DATE: 11/22/19
 PROJECT NO: 19-03104

SHEET NO:
 ASP.1



REVISION	DATE	BY	DESCRIPTION

CLIENT: MHT HOUSING, INC.
BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS
269 WINDER, DETROIT, MICHIGAN

CONCEPTUAL ARCHITECTURAL APARTMENT BLDG. FLOOR PLANS

PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTS
PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS
PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS
KEM-TEC & ASSOCIATES
225 EASTPOINTE, MI 48022
(586)772-2222 PHONE
(586)772-4048 FAX

DRAWN BY: EFG
SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"
DATE: 11/22/19
PROJECT NO: 19-03104
SHEET NO: A.1.1

KEY HISTORICAL ELEMENTS OF DESIGN



HEIGHT

Height varies in the district from (1) to eleven (11) stories. In the area between Woodward and Brush, the original development was almost exclusively two and one-half (2 1/2) story houses. Late changes included the construction of apartment buildings among the houses, the majority of which are three (3) stories in height. The tallest building, the former Detroit Hotel, is located on Woodward Avenue in the commercial strip. All other buildings more than four (4) stories in height are located between Woodward and John R., and generally on or immediately adjacent to buildings on those streets. East of Brush, the original development ranged from one (1) to two and one-half (2 1/2) stories. Later redevelopment includes apartment buildings not more than four (4) stories tall, most often located on Brush. In the case of the nineteenth century houses located between Woodward and Brush, the two and one half (2 1/2) story height implies more height in feet than usual, since ceiling heights in these houses are unusually high.



PROPORTION OF BUILDING'S FRONT FACADE

Buildings in the district are usually taller than wide; horizontal proportions exist only in incompatible later buildings, except for row house buildings.



PROPORTION OF OPENINGS WITHIN THE FACADE

Areas of void generally constitute between fifteen (15) percent and thirty-five (35) percent of the total facade area excluding roof. Proportions of the **openings themselves are generally taller than wide; in some cases, vertically proportioned units are combined to fill an opening wider than tall.**



RHYTHM OF SOLIDS TO VOIDS IN FRONT FACADE

Victorian structures in the district often **display great freedom in the placement of openings in the facades**, although older examples are generally more regular in such placement than later examples. In later apartments, openings tend to be very regular.



RELATIONSHIP OF MATERIALS

By far the most prevalent material in the district is common brick; other forms of brick, stone and wood trim are common; wood is used as a structural material only east of Brush. Some later buildings have stucco wall surfaces. Originally, roofs were wood or slate with an occasional example of tile; asphalt replacement roofs are common.



RELATIONSHIP OF TEXTURES

The most common **relationship of textures in the district is the low-relief pattern of mortar joints in brick contrasted to the smoother or rougher surfaces** of stone or wood trim. Slate, wood or tile roofs contribute particular textural values where they exist, especially in the case of slates or shingles or other than rectangular shape.




RELATIONSHIP OF COLORS

Brick red predominates, both in the form of natural color brick and in the form of painted brick. **Other natural brick and stone colors are also present. These relate to painted woodwork in various colors**, and there is an occasional example of stained woodwork. Roofs of other than asphalt are in natural colors; older slate roofs are often laid in patterns with various colors of slate. **Original color schemes** for any given building may be determined by professional analysis of the paint layers on the building, and when so determined are always appropriate for that building.



RELATIONSHIP OF ROOF SHAPES

Examples of many roof shapes, including pitched gable roofs, hip roofs, mansard roofs, and gambrel roofs are present. Different types are sometimes combined in a single structure and tower roofs, cupolas, lanterns, belvederes, monitors, conical roofs are used on various Victorian houses. Flat roof areas in the center of hip or mansard roofs are frequent. **Later apartment and commercial buildings generally have flat roofs not visible from the ground.** Generally tall roofs add height to houses of the Victorian period.



WALLS OF CONTINUITY

Between Woodward and Brush, the houses originally honored common setbacks which provided for front lawns. Some of the later apartments have not been set back to the same line as the houses amongst which they were built, thus disturbing the original line of continuity. On Woodward, the **commercial development is typically at the sidewalk, creating a wall of continuity;** this is not entirely continuous due to parking lots and some buildings set well back. On John R. and Brush, and east of Brush, buildings are typically placed at or near the sidewalk with little or no front yard. Where buildings are continuous, a wall of continuity is created.



RELATIONSHIP OF LANDSCAPE FEATURES AND SURFACE TREATMENTS

The major landscape feature of the district is vacant land, which creates a feeling that buildings are missing in the district. Some houses have more than the standard fifty (50) foot lot, and have wide side yards. **Individual houses have front lawns often subdivided by walks leading to the entrance;** lawns are exceedingly shallow or non-existent in the area between Beaubien and Brush. **Side drives are rare, access to garages or coach houses being from the alleys.**



RELATIONSHIP OF OPEN SPACE TO STRUCTURES

There is a large quantity of open space in the area, due to demolition of buildings. The character of this open space is haphazard as it relates to buildings, and indicates the unplanned nature of demolitions due to decline. **The feeling created is that buildings are missing and should be present.** On Watson and Edmund between John R. and Brush, the streets have been removed and replaced with landscaped malls. The traditional relationship of houses to street has thus become a relationship between houses and landscaped strip open space.



SCALE OF FACADES AND FACADE ELEMENTS

In the large houses between John R. and Brush, the scale tends to be large, and the facade elements scaled and disposed to emphasize the large size of the houses. Towers, setbacks, porches and the like divide facades into large elements. On Woodward, the scale ranges from very large, and emphasized by many small window openings, as in the former Detroit Hotel, and very large, made up of large architectural elements, such as the churches, down to quite small, with large windows emphasizing the small size, as in some commercial fronts. East of Brush, the scale is smaller and the detail less elaborate, creating a more intimate setting with the buildings closer to the street. **Later apartments are large in scale with simple but large elements near the ground and repetitive window openings above,** frequently capped by a substantial cornice.



RHYTHM OF BUILDING SETBACKS


Buildings on the **north-south streets generally have little or no setback, while older houses on the east-west streets between Woodward and Brush have some setback,** which varies from street to street, though generally consistent in any one block. Later apartments and commercial structures in the area often ignore the previously established setback. **Between Brush and Beaubien, setback is generally very limited, only a few feet, if any lawn space being provided between sidewalk and building.**



DEGREE OF COMPLEXITY WITH THE FACADES

The older houses in the district are generally characterized by a high degree of **complexity within the facades,** with bay windows, towers, porches, windows and door hoods, elaborate cornices and other devices used to decorate the buildings. Newer houses in the northern end of the district and older houses in the southern end tend to be somewhat simpler than high Victorian structures between them; later apartment and commercial buildings tend to more **classical decorative elements of a simpler kind.**





GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTER

The environmental character is of an **old urban neighborhood which has undergone, and is undergoing, considerable change.** The original development, reflected in the Victorian period houses, has been altered by the provision of more intensive residential development in the early twentieth century, the change in character of Woodward from residential to commercial at about the same time, and a long period of decline.

HISTORIC (50+ YEARS)



TURN OF THE 21ST C.



TODAY





View from Winder and Brush



View from Winder and Brush

KEY DEVELOPMENTS:


- Variation in tone, texture, and size of concrete planks applied to a simple massing continues to be the basis of design
- Additional projection at Winder-Brush corner adds planar variation
- Red tone is more prevalent, improving the desired historic neighborhood fit and palette (see Materials page)
- Coping at building top



• Red is predominant color on winder



• Projection at Winder corner with recessed window combination and bronze spandrels



• Projection and depth at Northeast corner



WINDOWS AND STOREFRONT

Windows, doors, and storefront to be an energy efficient window system with insulated glass, 4 1/2" frame depth, dark bronze color.



FIBER REINFORCED CONCRETE PANELS


Panels to be applied in a rainscreen system with slot venting for P-TAC units. Two colors fields (Red and Tan) with varied texture & widths (3", 6", and 12" planks) coursed vertically.



SKIN PATTERN, DETAIL, AND VARIATION


Varied widths and textures combined with slotted areas that screen P-Tac heating units create a rich facade system on an otherwise simple building mass and window pattern.











NORTH ELEVATION

3-11-2020 STAFF REPORT

STAFF REPORT 03-11-2020 MEETING

PREPARED BY: G. LANDSBERG

APPLICATION NUMBER: 20-6663

ADDRESSES: 269 WINDER (4 PARCELS INCLUDING 2515 BRUSH, 269, 281, 291 WINDER)

HISTORIC DISTRICT: BRUSH PARK

APPLICANT: MHT HOUSING, INC./KEM-TEC/HAMILTON ANDERSON

OWNER: CITY OF DETROIT (PENDING SALE TO APPLICANT)

DATE OF COMPLETE APPLICATION: 02-25-2020

DATE OF STAFF VISIT: 03-08-2020

SCOPE: ERECT A NEW MIXED-USE APARTMENT BUILDING



View of 2515 Brush at corner of Winder and Brush, looking northwest. Staff photo, March 8, 2020.


PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes to erect a four-story mixed-use apartment building consisting of 58 affordable housing units (100% affordable) at Brush and Winder Streets. The building will be oriented along Brush, providing commercial storefront and a community room at the sidewalk level with residential units above. Along with the associated parking lot and green space, the development will occupy four currently vacant parcels running west along Winder. This **new construction proposal** is for a building of contemporary design with facades of light and dark gray reinforced concrete panels and a regular fenestration pattern of vertically-oriented windows. The windows and storefronts will be light and dark bronze, except those windows in areas of dark panels, which will be off-white.

The parcels have been vacant lots since demolition of the historic buildings on them in recent decades.



Parcel viewer satellite view of vicinity. Project parcels outlined in red.



1921 Sanborn map of vicinity. The only historic structure in this image still extant is indicated by arrow (see current photo next page). Brick buildings are indicated in red, wood frame in yellow.



View of project site at approximate location of 281 Winder. Staff photo. See 1980 view page 5.



View towards west at project site showing adjacent historic building (245-255 Winder, see Sanborn map) and mid-2000s contextual development west of John R intersection. Staff photo.

STAFF OBSERVATIONS AND RESEARCH

Like many of the parcels in the Brush Park Historic District (established in 1980), the four (now city-owned) parcels subject to this development proposal once held historic buildings that suffered a long period of deterioration, multiple owners, off-and-on stabilization efforts, intervention by the HDC and its staff, condemnation, and ultimately demolition from the late 1990s through the late 2000s:

- The historic mansion at 269 Winder was demolished under an emergency demolition order issued in 2009. Previously it had received an emergency demolition order in 1999, followed by a MOA between the city and the former owner to mothball and secure the building as part of the large Crosswinds development project. Roof coverings were installed but were failing by the early 2000s. The HDC did issue a COA for an \$860,000 rehabilitation to the former owner in 2007, but another emergency demolition was ordered and executed about two years later. HDC does not review emergency demolition orders.




HDAB Designation Photo of 269 Winder, 1980. Demolished 2009.

- The historic multi-unit building at 281 Winder was demolished under an emergency declaration order from BSEED, also in 2009. This building, “The Yale,” was of red brick and stone construction and presented a modest two-story residential façade to the street, with a tile roof. An extensive apartment wing extended to the rear covering most of the parcel (see Sanborn map, page 2).



HDAB Designation Photo of 281 Winder, 1980. This is approximately the view of the current photo at top of page 3.




Google Street View photo of 269 and 281 Winder from 2007, about two years before demolition.

- The demolition of 291 Winder, another multi-unit building, was permitted by a COA issued to James Marusich (PDD) in 2003, as the HDC found that the building was no longer contributing to the character of the district. The 2002 Sanborn map records it as vacant and open to trespass. Four years earlier it had been subject to the same MOA as 269 Winder and considered likely for rehabilitation.



HDAB Designation Photo of 291 Winder, 1980. The original nineteenth century three-story mansion featured red brick and a spectacularly intricate and ornamented roof line and porch. Note the early twentieth century apartment block addition extending to the rear, a typical addition in Brush Park to accommodate more residents in the twentieth century.

- The historic building at 2515-31 Brush was a 1920s era single-story commercial building that consisted of storefronts oriented to the east along Brush. This building was permitted to be demolished by the HDC at the May 2003 meeting, under Notice to Proceed condition 2, stating that the structure was a deterrent to a major improvement program which will be of substantial benefit to the community. It is unclear what program the NTP was referring to, as nothing was ever built. The applicant was also James Marusich (PDD).
- The Brush Park Historic District, unique among the city's historic districts, is the only district be described in its Elements of Design for general environmental character (#22) with the phrase "a long period of decline." Since this sentence was written in 1980, this decline has generally continued, with some limited redevelopment but a disastrous loss of historic fabric throughout the district.
- At some point in recent years all four subject parcels became publicly owned.
- Importantly, none of the above projects or actions are connected to the current applicant, who was identified by the city of Detroit after an RFP process to redevelop the site for affordable housing



2002 Sanborn map of vicinity. X=demolished, V-B=vacant and boarded. V-O=vacant and open. White arrow points to extant building, now rehabilitated, at 245-255 Winder. Note 1920s store building at 2515 Brush.



Current view along Brush looking south towards the CBD/stadium area, across Fisher freeway. Staff photo.



Current view along Winder looking east towards the proposal site, showing existing context. Staff photo.



Current view along Brush to the north of site, with other recently approved “white” buildings in vicinity. Staff photo.

In the last four years, the nearly century-long decline of Brush Park as a stable residential enclave has finally been arrested, and the neighborhood has seen a remarkable flurry of rehabilitation, development and construction. The streets adjacent to this development parcel are lined with new buildings either just completed or well underway. Because of the dozens of demolitions of historic buildings suffered by the district, the cohesiveness of Brush Park as a historic area is beginning to feel stretched. Staff suggests that it may be necessary for the HDC to consider certain aspects of projects which may help preserve the basis of the district's historic character while continuing to allow for dense redevelopment of the district's vacant lots.

Several buildings, including two to the immediate north of the project site, are rendered in light or white colors and flat elevations typical of recent development projects elsewhere in Detroit, and nationwide. There are times, in cohesive architectural districts, where a "one off" building that is stridently modern and even geographically atypical helps to sharpen the appreciation of the historic context. The most prominent example in architectural history is the construction of SOM's Lever House on New York City's Park Avenue in the early post-war era, which was a glassy skyscraper effectively juxtaposed against its brick and stone neighbors. However, continued proliferation of "one off" buildings in Brush Park appears to be resulting in the creation of an architectural theme park with no coherent connection to the historic Elements of Design that the Commission is obliged to consider. It is worth quoting the district's Elements on materials (#7) and color (#9) in their entirety:

"By far the most prevalent material in the district is common brick; other forms of brick, stone and wood trim are common; wood is used as a structural material only east of Brush. Some later buildings have stucco wall surfaces. Originally, roofs were wood or slate with an occasional example of tile; asphalt replacement roofs are common."

"Brick red predominates, both in the form of natural color brick and in the form of painted brick. Other natural brick and stone colors are also present. These relate to painted woodwork in various colors, and there is an occasional example of stained woodwork."

Almost without peer among Detroit's historic districts, Brush Park once had a remarkably unified collection of red brick and stone buildings with somberly painted trim, architectural heft, dazzling ornamentation, and deeply articulated detailing. Some of the recent developments have gone further than others in incorporating the historic materials and color palette, and reinterpreting it in a reasonable and cost-effective modern form. Others have pursued a contrasting approach, aiming for airiness and freedom in form, which has also found favor with the Commission as a modern interpretation of Victorian playfulness and creativity found historically in the district's ornamentation. Staff recommends that it is an appropriate time for the Commission to consider a course correction, with the specific intent of reinforcing certain neglected Elements of Design that make Brush Park recognizably a historic district. At a minimum, staff suggests that the Commission consider limiting the preponderance of "flat" elevations and buildings rendered in dominant bright or light colors, which in particular seem to be at odds with the historic context and the established Elements of Design.



View along Alfred Street showing new construction effectively responding to the historic context. Staff photo.



View along John R to south, showing recently constructed apartment building in vicinity. Staff photo.

ISSUES

- The proposal is for a series of vacant lots in an area with limited immediate historic context, but the parcel is at a highly visible entry point to the neighborhood near the southeast corner, with a connection over the Fisher freeway to the stadium area and central business district.
- A defining feature of the Brush Park Historic District amongst its historic buildings is the use of red/brown brick, natural stone, and articulation of exterior surfaces (windows, ornamentation) with pronounced recession, projection, and shadow lines. This approach to architectural features should extend to new buildings to protect the integrity of the district, per the Standards.
- The Commission has recently (2015-2019) approved a number of contemporary buildings in Brush Park. Some of these have not hewed strictly to the Elements of Design, diluting the overall historic context and potentially endangering the historic character of the District.
- Massing, size, scale and streetwall orientation are consistent with the District’s Elements of Design for large apartment buildings, in staff’s opinion.
- Storefront treatment along Brush is consistent with previous historic development on the site.
- The District would clearly benefit from the additional density represented by the development. Brush Park was historically a very dense residential district.



Distant view of Brush Park HD from the southwest. Note high visibility of “white” buildings amid general district character. Staff photo.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Section 21-2-73, Certificate of Appropriateness

It is staff's opinion that, **with the two proposed conditions below**, the project should qualify for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff recommends that the Commission approve a COA for the proposed application, as it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, especially Standard #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.

With the conditions that the applicant:

1. Revise the white (lighter) colored fiber reinforced concrete panels to a more appropriate (darker) color; and,
2. Revise the elevations to make the building elevations less flat; at a minimum, by deepening the window recesses or otherwise giving openings, edges, or rooflines more depth, weight, articulation and/or shadow lines, subject to approval of both HDC and PDD design review staff.

Section 21-2-5, Effects of projects on districts

Since the project involves a discretionary action by the city involving a sale of publicly-owned property in or adjacent to a city-owned historic district, the Commission has the obligation to make a finding concerning the "demonstrable effects of the proposed project and report same to the Mayor and City Council." The intent of this section is to provide guidance to city government prior to committing to a particular course of action, under the following requirement:

A City-financed, licensed, permitted, authorized or contracted physical development project shall be considered to have a demonstrable effect on a designated or proposed historic district when any condition of the project creates a change, beneficial or adverse, in the quality of the historical, architectural, archeological, engineering, social or cultural significance that qualified the property for designation as an historic district or that may qualify the property for designation as an historic district. Generally, adverse effects occur under conditions which include:

- (1) *Destruction or alteration of all or part of a resource;*
- (2) *Isolation from or alteration of the surrounding environment of a resource;*
- (3) *Introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with the resource and its setting;*
- (4) *Transfer or sale of a City-owned resource without adequate conditions or restrictions regarding preservation, maintenance, or use; and*
- (5) *Neglect of a resource resulting in its deterioration or destruction.*

Staff recommends that the Commission find a demonstrable effect, and that it is likely to be **beneficial**.

BRUSH PARK ELEMENTS OF DESIGN

(1)

Height. Height varies in the district from one to 11 stories. In the area between Woodward Avenue and Brush, the original development was almost exclusively 2½ story houses. Later changes included the construction of apartment buildings among the houses, the majority of which are three stories in height. The tallest building, the former Detroit Hotel, is located on Woodward Avenue in the commercial strip. All other buildings more than four stories in height are located between Woodward Avenue and John R, and generally on or immediately adjacent to buildings on those streets. East of Brush, the original development ranged from one to 2½ stories. Later redevelopment includes apartment buildings not more than four stories tall, most often located on Brush. In the case of the 19th Century houses located between Woodward Avenue and Brush, the 2½ story height implies more height in feet than usual, since ceiling heights in these houses are unusually high.

(2)

Proportion of building's front façade. Buildings in the district are usually taller than wide; horizontal proportions exist only in incompatible later buildings, except for row house buildings.

(3)

Proportion of openings within the façades. Areas of void generally constitute between 15 percent and 35 percent of the total façade area, excluding the roof. Proportions of the openings themselves are generally taller than wide; in some cases, vertically proportioned units are combined to fill an opening wider than tall.

(4)

Rhythm of solids to voids in front façade. Victorian structures in the district often display great freedom in the placement of openings in the façades, although older examples are generally more regular in such placement than later examples. In later apartments, openings tend to be very regular.

(5)

Rhythm of spacing of buildings on streets. The area between Woodward Avenue and Brush appears to have been developed in a very regular spacing, with 50-foot lots. This regularity has been disrupted by the demolition of many of the houses, and the vacant land resulting, as well as the occasional combination of lots for larger structures, particularly close to Woodward Avenue. East of Brush, smaller lots were used in subdividing, but many buildings stand on more land than one lot, and the parcel sizes are now quite irregular, as is the placement of buildings.

(6)

Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projections. Most buildings have or had a porch or entrance projection. The variety inherent in Victorian design precludes the establishment of any absolute rhythm, but such projections were often centered. On Woodward Avenue, the commercial nature of most buildings and the widening of Woodward Avenue has effectively eliminated such projections.

(7)

Relationship of materials. By far the most prevalent material in the district is common brick; other forms of brick, stone and wood trim are common; wood is used as a structural material only east of Brush. Some later buildings have stucco wall surfaces. Originally, roofs were wood or slate with an occasional example of tile; asphalt replacement roofs are common.

(8)

Relationship of textures. The most common relationship of textures in the district is the low-relief pattern of mortar joints in brick contrasted to the smoother or rougher surfaces of stone or wood trim. Slate,

wood, or tile roofs contribute particular textural values where they exist, especially in the case of slates or shingles of other than rectangular shape.

(9)

Relationship of colors. Brick red predominates, both in the form of natural color brick and in the form of painted brick. Other natural brick and stone colors are also present. These relate to painted woodwork in various colors, and there is an occasional example of stained woodwork. Roofs of other than asphalt are in natural colors; older slate roofs are often laid in patterns with various colors of slate. Original color schemes for any given building may be determined by professional analysis of the paint layers on the building, and when so determined are always appropriate for that building.

(10)

Relationship of architectural detail. On the buildings of the Victorian period, elaborate detail in wood, stone, or sheet metal was common; areas treated include porches, window and door surrounds, cornices, dormers, and other areas. Later buildings are generally simpler, but include less elaborate detail in similar areas.

(11)

Relationship of roof shapes. Examples of many roof shapes, including pitched gable roofs, hip roofs, mansard roofs, and gambrel roofs are present. Different types are sometimes combined in a single structure, and tower roofs, cupolas, lanterns, belvideres, monitors, conical roofs are used on various Victorian houses. Flat roof areas in the center of hip or mansard roofs are frequent. Later apartment and commercial buildings generally have flat roofs not visible from the ground. The generally tall roofs add height to the houses of the Victorian period.

(12)

Walls of continuity. Between Woodward Avenue and Brush, the houses originally honored common setbacks which provided for front lawns. Some of the later apartments have not been set back to the same line as the houses amongst which they were built, thus disturbing the original line of continuity. On Woodward Avenue, the commercial development is typically at the sidewalk, creating a wall of continuity. This is not entirely continuous due to parking lots and some buildings set well back. On John R and Brush, and east of Brush, buildings are typically placed at or near the sidewalk with little or no front yard. Where buildings are continuous, a wall of continuity is created.

(13)

Relationship of significant landscape features and surface treatments. The major landscape feature of the district is the vacant land, which creates a feeling that buildings are missing in the district. Some houses have more than the standard 50-foot lot and have wide side yards. Individual houses have front lawns often subdivided by walks leading to the entrance; lawns are exceedingly shallow or nonexistent in the area between Beaubien and Brush. Side drives are rare, access to garages or coach houses being from the alleys. The closing of Watson and Edmund Place between John R and Brush has created landscaped malls uncharacteristic to the district. Some walks of stone slabs have survived; others have been replaced in concrete. Sidewalks are characteristically close to the curb.

(14)

Relationship of open space to structures. There is a large quantity of open space in the area, due to demolition of buildings. The character of this open space is haphazard as it relates to buildings, and indicates the unplanned nature of demolitions due to decline. The feeling created is that buildings are missing and should be present. On Watson and Edmund between John R and Brush, the streets have been removed and replaced with landscaped malls. The traditional relationship of houses to street has thus become a relationship between houses and landscaped strip open space.

(15)

Scale of façades and façade elements. In the large houses between John R and Brush, the scale tends to be large, and the façade elements scaled and disposed to emphasize the large size of the houses. Towers, setbacks, porches and the like divide façades into large elements. On Woodward Avenue, the scale ranges from very large, and emphasized by many small window openings, as in the former Detroit Hotel, and very large, made up of large architectural elements, such as the churches, down to quite small, with large windows emphasizing the small size, as in some commercial fronts. East of Brush, the scale is smaller and the detail less elaborate, creating a more intimate setting with the buildings closer to the street. Later apartments are in scale with simple but large elements near the ground and repetitive window openings above, frequently capped by a substantial cornice.

(16)

Directional expression of front façades. A substantial majority of the buildings in the district have front façades vertically expressed. Exceptions are some commercial buildings on Woodward Avenue, row houses on John R or Brush, and some duplexes or row houses east of Brush.

(17)

Rhythm of building setbacks. Buildings on the north-south streets generally have little or no setback, while older houses on the east-west streets between Woodward Avenue and Brush have some setback, which varies from street to street, though generally consistent in any one block. Later apartments and commercial structures in that area often ignore the previously established setback. Between Brush and Beaubien, setback is generally very limited, only a few feet, if any, of lawn space being provided between sidewalk and building.

(18)

Relationship of lot coverage. Older single-family houses between Woodward Avenue and Brush generally occupy about 25 to 30 percent of the building lot, not including coachhouses or garages. Later apartments and commercial buildings often fill a much higher percentage of the lot, sometimes approaching or reaching complete lot coverage. Between Brush and Beaubien, lot coverage for residential structures is generally about 40 percent, with commercial and later apartment buildings again occupying a larger percentage of their lots.

(19)

Degree of complexity with the façades. The older houses in the district are generally characterized by a high degree of complexity within the façades, with bay windows, towers, porches, window and door hoods, elaborate cornices, and other devices used to decorate the buildings. Newer houses in the northern end of the district and older houses in the southern end tend to be somewhat simpler than the high Victorian structures between them; later apartments and commercial buildings tend to have more classical decorative elements of a simpler kind.

(20)

Orientation, vistas, overviews. Houses are generally oriented to the east-west streets, while apartments and commercial structures are more often oriented to the north-south streets. The construction of the Fisher Freeway has created an artificial public view of the rear yards on Winder between Woodward and Brush. The vacant land in the area, largely the result of demolition, creates long-distance views and views of individual buildings from unusual angles which are foreign to the character of the neighborhood as an intensely developed urban area. Garages and coach houses are located in the rear of residential properties and are generally oriented to the alley.

(21)

Symmetric or asymmetric appearance. In the Victorian structures, examples of both symmetric and asymmetric design occur; symmetry is more characteristic of the earlier houses, while the high Victorian examples are more likely to assemble elements in a romantic, asymmetric composition. Later houses to

the north are more often symmetrical, especially when derived from classical precedent. Asymmetrical but balanced compositions are common. Later apartments are generally symmetrical.

(22)

General environmental character. The environmental character is of an old urban neighborhood which has undergone, and is undergoing, considerable change. The original development, reflected in the Victorian period houses, has been altered by the provision of more intensive residential development in the early 20th Century, the change in character of Woodward Avenue from residential to commercial at about the same time, and a long period of decline.

THIS IS A 3-PAGE FORM - ALL INFORMATION IS REQUIRED FOR PROJECT REVIEW

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION PROJECT REVIEW REQUEST

City of Detroit - Planning & Development Department
2 Woodward Avenue, Suite 808
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Date: 2/12/2020

PROPERTY INFORMATION

ADDRESS: 269 Winder Road, Detroit

AKA: _____

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Brush Park

SCOPE OF WORK: (Check ALL that apply)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Windows/ Doors	<input type="checkbox"/> Roof/Gutters/ Chimney	<input type="checkbox"/> Porch/ Deck	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Landscape/Fence/ Tree/Park	<input type="checkbox"/> General Rehab
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Construction	<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition	<input type="checkbox"/> Addition	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

APPLICANT IDENTIFICATION

Property Owner/
Homeowner Contractor Tenant or
Business Occupant Architect/Engineer/
Consultant

NAME: T. Van Fox

COMPANY NAME: MHT Housing, Inc.

ADDRESS: 269 Winder Road, Detroit

CITY: Bingham Farms

STATE: MI

ZIP: _____

PHONE: 248-833-0598

MOBILE: 734-679-5951

EMAIL: jliddell@mhthousing.net

PROJECT REVIEW REQUEST CHECKLIST

Please attach the following documentation to your request:

PLEASE KEEP FILE SIZE OF ENTIRE SUBMISSION UNDER 30MB

Completed Building Permit Application (highlighted portions only)

ePLANS Permit Number (only applicable if you've already applied for permits through ePLANS)

Photographs of ALL sides of existing building or site

Detailed photographs of location of proposed work (photographs to show existing condition(s), design, color, & material)

Description of existing conditions (including materials and design)

Description of project (if replacing any existing material(s), include an explanation as to why replacement--rather than repair--of existing and/or construction of new is required)

Detailed scope of work (formatted as bulleted list)

Brochure/cut sheets for proposed replacement material(s) and/or product(s), as applicable

NOTE:

Based on the scope of work, additional documentation may be required.

See www.detroitmi.gov/hdc for scope-specific requirements.

Upon receipt of this documentation, staff will review and inform you of the next steps toward obtaining your building permit from the Buildings, Safety Engineering and Environmental Department (BSEED) to perform the work.

SUBMIT COMPLETED REQUESTS TO HDC@DETROITMI.GOV

P2 - BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION

Date: 2/12/2020

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Address: 269 Winder Road, Detroit Floor: _____ Suite#: _____ Stories: 4
AKA: _____ Lot(s): See Survey Subdivision: See Survey
Parcel ID #(s): 01000594-604, 01000597, 01000596, 01000595-002L Total Acres: 0.907 Lot Width: 233.3' Lot Depth: 166'
Current Legal Use of Property: Vacant Proposed Use: Mixed Use: Multi-Family & Retail
Are there any existing buildings or structures on this parcel? Yes No

PROJECT INFORMATION

Permit Type: New Alteration Addition Demolition Correct Violations
 Foundation Only Change of Use Temporary Use Other: _____
 Revision to Original Permit #: _____ (Original permit has been issued and is active)

Description of Work (Describe in detail proposed work and use of property, attach work list)

To build a senior living building. The building is mixed use on the first floor, with retail along Brush Street.

The remainder of the floors will be dedicated to the residential units.

MBC use change No MBC use change

Included Improvements (Check all applicable; these trade areas require separate permit applications)

HVAC/Mechanical Electrical Plumbing Fire Sprinkler System Fire Alarm

Structure Type

New Building Existing Structure Tenant Space Garage/Accessory Building
 Other: _____ Size of Structure to be Demolished (LxWxH) _____ cubic ft.

Construction involves changes to the floor plan? Yes No

(e.g. interior demolition or construction to new walls)

Use Group: Mixed Business Bldg & Residential (R-1) Type of Construction (per current MI Bldg Code Table 601) Type 5a

Estimated Cost of Construction \$ 11,002,146 \$ _____
By Contractor By Department

Structure Use

Residential-Number of Units: 58 Office-Gross Floor Area _____ Industrial-Gross Floor Area _____
 Commercial-Gross Floor Area: 1,123 Institutional-Gross Floor Area _____ Other-Gross Floor Area _____

Proposed No. of Employees: _____ List materials to be stored in the building: _____

PLOT PLAN SHALL BE submitted on separate sheets and shall show all easements and measurements (must be correct and in detail). SHOW ALL streets abutting lot, indicate front of lot, show all buildings, existing and proposed distances to lot lines. (Building Permit Application Continues on Next Page)

For Building Department Use Only

Intake By: _____ Date: _____ Fees Due: _____ DngBld? No

Permit Description:

Permit #: _____ Current Legal Land Use: _____ Proposed Use: _____

Permit#: _____ Date Permit Issued: _____ Permit Cost: \$ _____

Zoning District: _____ Zoning Grant(s): _____

Lots Combined? Yes No (attach zoning clearance)

Revised Cost (revised permit applications only) Old \$ _____ New \$ _____

Structural: _____ Date: _____ Notes: _____

Zoning: _____ Date: _____ Notes: _____

Other: _____ Date: _____ Notes: _____



IDENTIFICATION (All Fields Required)

Property Owner/Homeowner Property Owner/Homeowner is Permit Applicant
Name: T. Van Fox Company Name: MHT Housing, Inc.
Address: 32600 Telegraph Road City: Bingham Farms State: MI Zip: 48025
Phone: 248-833-0598 Mobile: 734-679-5951
Driver's License #: _____ Email: jliddell@mhthousing.net

Contractor Contractor is Permit Applicant
Representative Name: Chad Joseph Company Name: MHT Construction, LLC
Address: 32600 Telegraph Road City: Bingham Farms State: MI Zip: 48025
Phone: 248-833-0553 Mobile: 810-423-8652 Email: chad@mhthousing.net
City of Detroit License #: LIC2019-01453

TENANT OR BUSINESS OCCUPANT Tenant is Permit Applicant
Name: N/A Phone: _____ Email: _____

ARCHITECT/ENGINEER/CONSULTANT Architect/Engineer/Consultant is Permit Applicant
Name: Jeffrey Graham State Registration#: 1301035132 Expiration Date: 10/31/2020
Address: 22556 Gratiot Avenue City: Eastpointe State: MI Zip: 48021
Phone: 586 772-2222 Mobile: 313 618-0322 Email: JGraham@kemtec-survey.com

HOMEOWNER AFFIDAVIT (Only required for residential permits obtained by homeowner.)

I hereby certify that I am the legal owner and occupant of the subject property and the work described on this permit application shall be completed by me. I am familiar with the applicable codes and requirements of the City of Detroit and take full responsibility for all code compliance, fees and inspections related to the installation/work herein described. I shall neither hire nor sub-contract to any other person, firm or corporation any portion of the work covered by this building permit.

Print Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____
(Homeowner)
Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____ 20____ A.D. _____ County, Michigan
Signature: _____ My Commission Expires: _____
(Notary Public)

PERMIT APPLICANT SIGNATURE

I hereby certify that the information on this application is true and correct. I have reviewed all deed restrictions that may apply to this construction and am aware of my responsibility thereunder. I certify that the proposed work is authorized by the owner of the record and I have been authorized to make this application as the property owner(s) authorized agent. Further I agree to conform to all applicable laws and ordinances of jurisdiction. I am aware that a permit will expire when no inspections are requested and conducted within 180 days of the date of issuance or the date of the previous inspection and that expired permits cannot be

Print Name: Chad Joseph Signature: _____ Date: 2-11-2020
(Permit Applicant)
Driver's License #: J210115777932 Expiration: 12-07-2022
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 11 day of February 2020 A.D. Oakland County, Michigan
Signature: _____ My Commission Expires: 3/26/2020
(Notary Public)

Section 23a of the state construction code act of 1972, 1972PA230, MCL 125.1523A, prohibits a person from conspiring to circumvent the licensing requirements of this state relating to persons who are to perform work on a residential building or a residential structure. Visitors of Section 23a are subject to civil fines.

This application can also be completed online. Visit detroitmi.gov/bsecd/elaps for more information.





An affordable housing corporation
serving Michigan's housing needs

32600 TELEGRAPH ROAD, STL 102 CB BINGHAM FARMS, MICHIGAN 48025
T: 248.833.0550 F: 248.833.0551

February 14, 2020

Detroit Historic District Commission

Re: Brush Park Development
269 Winder, Detroit MI
Brush & Winder

Dear Detroit Historic District Commission,

MHT Housing, Inc. ("MHT") is a non-profit 501c3, developer of affordable housing established in 1990 for the purpose of preserving and creating high-quality affordable housing. Our thirty-year commitment to building apartment communities that enhance and revitalize neighborhoods has resulted in the development of 6,000 units within the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program; with over 3,000 units within the City of Detroit currently owned or managed by MHT's affiliate companies.

MHT's development activity is at the core of its mission and has long been centered on new construction and the acquisition and rehabilitation of existing housing stock. Our development team is experienced, disciplined, and acutely involved in all aspects of the development process. MHT works closely with communities and municipalities to address local housing need and provides the resources to match these needs with viable sites and development concepts for seniors and families. We have focused on cultivating important relationships with architects, engineers and general contractors to build high-quality affordable housing meeting green initiatives at a cost-effective price. Inherent in each new community is our commitment to create safe and desirable housing that promotes "pride of place" among our residents.

In addition to development activities, MHT has a great emphasis on community impact and customer service. Staff is motivated to not only keep up their communities, but to serve one another as partners, friends, and mentors. MHT finds it essential to support community organizations that benefit the neighborhoods we serve. Community service efforts include: community clean-ups, upgrades to community parks, donations to local libraries, hosting community dinners for those in need, supporting local high school athletic teams, participation in local parades and events, student scholarship awards, adopting families during the holiday season, and hosting the annual Miracle on Vernor in Southwest Detroit. MHT has been recognized by the City of Detroit and the City of Detroit Police Department as well as several other municipalities within the state for neighborhood clean-up initiatives and social services.



An affordable housing corporation
serving Michigan's housing needs

32600 TELEGRAPH ROAD, STE 102 ✪ BINGHAM FARMS, MICHIGAN 48025
T: 248.833.0550 F: 248.833.0551

MHT Housing, Inc. is excited to move forward with the new construction of a four-story, mixed-use affordable apartment community located at 269 Winder Street in Detroit, Michigan. The property will feature 58 affordable apartment units managed by MHT Housing's affiliated managing agent, MHT Management, LLC, together with just over roughly 1,100 square feet of commercial space. MHT plans to target a wide range of residents in this development and is working closely with the City of Detroit on a development that complements the neighborhood and aligns with the City's design requirements. With MHT's 30 years of affordable housing development experience, there will be sufficient strength and expertise to get this development completed. In looking at the landscape for those needing affordable housing options, the team feels that this housing development offers a great opportunity to provide affordable units in an area that is experiencing tremendous growth, creating a great outcome by allowing lower income wage earners to have access to amenities that they otherwise might not have.

The project consists of 6 studios and 52 one bedroom units. All units will be available for individuals and families regardless of their age. The development is planned to be a 4% and 9% deal through the Michigan State Housing Development Authority's Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program. The development team, contractor, and architect plan to complete the project in accordance with Enterprise Green Environmental Criteria, accessible community space over 1,000 square feet, 10% barrier free and 100% visitable units. The project will feature first class amenities for its residents. Each unit will feature energy efficient appliances including washers and dryers, frost free refrigerators, ovens, ranges with hoods, disposals, microwaves and central air conditioning. The development team is committed to working closely with the City of Detroit to build and construct the property with neighborhood features and local design requirements.

Enclosed please find the complete Historic District Commission package for your review. We appreciate your support of this project and look forward to your timely review. Please contact Jen Liddell, jliddell@mhthousing.net, 248-833-0598 with any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "T. Van Fox". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

T. Van Fox, President
MHT Housing, Inc.

BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS


269 Winder Street, Detroit

PREPARED FOR:

CITY OF DETROIT HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION HEARING

NOTE:
Elevation Views on Pages 11-14 have been updated
February 25, 2020





269 WINDER STREET

Strategically located along the pedestrian and vehicular connector between the central business district and the Historic Brush Park residential district, the Brush Park Apartments at 269 Winder will contribute to the fabric, vibrancy, and accessibility of the neighborhood.

The building will house 58 affordable one-bedroom and studio apartment units, community rooms including a prominent ground-floor corner location, and retail space that will serve residents and neighbors.

The proposed development is uniquely positioned to anchor the Brush Park neighborhood at a critical entry point, strengthen Brush Street as a major Detroit neighborhood connector, and anchor a residential street (Winder). The project is sensitive to its historic neighbors while building on aspects of the development to the north in scale and spirit of contemporary architecture.

Material, texture, and color, as well as opening pattern, scale, and proportion have been evaluated relative to historic and contemporary Brush Park buildings. Buildability, longevity, and affordability are considerations while striving for a thoughtful and inventive solution.

PROJECT: BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS
CLIENT: MHT HOUSING, INC.
LOCATION: 269 WINDER, DETROIT

Scope of Work:

This project is to build a senior living building. The building will be mixed use on the first floor, with retail along Brush Street. The remainder of the first floor will be dedicated to the residential units. Parking for both retail and residents will be provided on site. The first floor will hold the offices, mechanical/utility room, the main community room and 2 ADA public restrooms. The building will be equipped with an elevator and two egress staircases.

Legal Description:

LAND SITUATED IN THE CITY OF DETROIT, COUNTY OF WAYNE, STATE OF MICHIGAN, DESCRIBED AS:

2515 BRUSH - TAX NUMBER: 01000598-604
 LOT 1, EXCEPT THE WEST 9 FEET, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

291 WINDER - TAX NUMBER: 01000597
 THE WEST 9 FEET OF LOT 2 AND THE EAST 35 FEET OF LOT 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

N. WINDER - TAX NUMBER: 01000596
 THE WEST 15 FEET OF LOT 2 AND THE EAST 1/2 OF LOT 3, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

269 WINDER - 01000595.002L
 THE WEST 1/2 OF LOT 3 AND ALL OF LOT 4, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

ALSO
 LOT 5, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

THE PERIMETER DESCRIPTION BELOW COMPRISES PARCELS 1 THROUGH 4 AND A PORTION OF PARCEL 5.

LAND IN THE CITY OF DETROIT, WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN BEING ALL OF LOTS 1 THROUGH 4 AND PART OF LOT 5 BLOCK 2 BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS; AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE WEST LINE OF BRUSH STREET (60 FEET WIDE) AND THE NORTH LINE OF WINDER STREET (60 FEET WIDE), BEING THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 1; THENCE S59°16'09"W 233.30 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF WINDER STREET; THENCE N30°24'30"W 165.88 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF A PUBLIC ALLEY (20 FEET WIDE); THENCE N59°16'09"E 242.96 FEET ALONG SAID SOUTH ALLEY LINE TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 1 AND THE WEST LINE OF BRUSH STREET; THENCE S27°04'30"E 166.22 FEET ALONG SAID WEST LINE TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING AND CONTAINING 0.907 ACRES.

PROPERTY INFO:
 LOT AREA: 39,501± SF OR 0.907 ± ACRES

BUILDING
 FLOORS: 4
 HEIGHT: _____
 BUILDING FOOTPRINT: 11,368 SF
 BUILDING SIZE: 45,631 SF

APARTMENT UNITS
 6 - STUDIO UNITS
 52 - 1 BEDROOM UNITS
 58 UNITS

USE: MIXED USE - FIRST FLOOR RETAIL & RESIDENTIAL
 SECOND TO FOURTH FLOOR RESIDENTIAL

LOT COVERAGE
 11,536/39,501 = 29%

ZONING DESIGNATION
 PD-H: PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT - HISTORICAL

"LOT DIMENSIONS, SETBACKS, HEIGHT LIMITATIONS, LOT COVERAGE PERCENTAGE AND FLOOR AREA RATIOS SHOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO THE NATURE OF THE PROJECT AND RELATE WELL TO SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT." (Sec. 50-13-122)

RESIDENTIAL DENSITY
 58 UNITS/0.29 ACRES = 200 UNITS PER ACRE


FAR
 BUILDABLE LAND AREA = 39,501 SF
 GROSS FLOOR AREA = 45,631 SF
 FAR = 45,631/39,501
 FAR = 1.16

SHEET INDEX

ARCHITECTURAL	
ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN	ASP.1
NEIGHBORHOOD SITE PLAN	ASP.2
LANDSCAPE PLAN	LP.1
FIRST FLOOR PLAN	A.1.1
SECOND - FOURTH FLOOR PLAN	A.1.2
ENLARGED UNIT FLOOR PLAN	A.1.2
EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS	A.2.1
EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS	A.2.2
EXTERIOR RENDERINGS	A.3.1
PHOTOMETRIC PLAN	

SURVEY



ALTA/TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY	1
-------------------------	---



LEGEND

(Symbol)	ELECTRIC MANHOLE
(Symbol)	HAND HOLE
(Symbol)	UTILITY POLE
(Symbol)	GAS VALVE
(Symbol)	LIGHT POLE WITH STREET LAMP
(Symbol)	SANITARY MANHOLE
(Symbol)	SQUARE CATCH BASIN
(Symbol)	FIRE HYDRANT
(Symbol)	WATER GATE MANHOLE
(Symbol)	WATER VALVE
(Symbol)	STEAM VAULT
(Symbol)	LIGHTPOST/LAMP POST
(Symbol)	SINGLE POST SIGN
(Symbol)	DECIDUOUS TREE (AS NOTED)
(Symbol)	OVERHEAD UTILITY LINE
(Symbol)	GAS LINE
(Symbol)	SEWER LINE
(Symbol)	WATER LINE
(Symbol)	STEAM LINE

NOTE: ALL UTILITIES LISTED ARE EXISTING UNLESS STATED OTHERWISE.



ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN

NOT TO SCALE

See Full Size Sheet Also Included in the Submission

NO.	DATE	BY	DESCRIPTION
1	02-06-2020	M.L./A.G.	PPR MEETING

CLIENT: MHT HOUSING, INC.
BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS
 269 WINDER, DETROIT, MICHIGAN
 SITE AREA: 39,501± SF OR 0.907 ± ACRES

CONCEPTUAL ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN

PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTS
 PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS
 2255 EAST WINDY AVENUE
 EAST-POINT, MI 48021
 (586)772-2222 PHONE
 (586)772-4048 FAX



APPLICANT: MHT HOUSING, INC.
 32600 TELEGRAPH RD., #102
 BURLINGAME, CA 94010
 PHONE: 586.833.0650

DRAWN BY: JFG
 SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"
 DATE: 11/22/19
 PROJECT NO: 19-03104

SHEET NO:
 ASP.1

PARCEL ID: 01000612
ZONE: PD-H: PLANNED
DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTED -
HISTORICAL

PARCEL ID: 01000609-11
ZONE: PD-H: PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
DISTRICTED - HISTORICAL

PARCEL ID: 01000605-8
ZONE: PD-H: PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
DISTRICTED - HISTORICAL

PARCEL ID: 01000592
ZONE: PD-H: PLANNED
DEVELOPMENT
DISTRICTED - HISTORICAL

PARCEL ID: 01000595.001
ZONE: PD-H: PLANNED
DEVELOPMENT
DISTRICTED - HISTORICAL

PARCEL ID: 01000598-604, 01000597,
01000596 & 01000595.002L
ZONE: PD-H: PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
DISTRICTED - HISTORICAL

58 UNIT APARTMENT BLDG.
BUILDING FOOTPRINT: 11,368 SF
TOTAL GROSS AREA: 45,631 SF

BRUSH STREET 60' WD.

WINDER STREET 60' WD.

NOT TO SCALE
See Full Size Sheet Also Included in the Submission




SITE STRATEGY - DETAIL

KEY HISTORICAL ELEMENTS OF DESIGN




HEIGHT

Height varies in the district from (1) to eleven (11) stories. In the area between Woodward and Brush, the original development was almost exclusively two and one-half (2 1/2) story houses. Late changes included the construction of apartment buildings among the houses, the majority of which are three (3) stories in height. The tallest building, the former Detroit Hotel, is located on Woodward Avenue in the commercial strip. All other buildings more than four (4) stories in height are located between Woodward and John R., and generally on or immediately adjacent to buildings on those streets. East of Brush, the original development ranged from one (1) to two and one-half (2 1/2) stories. Later redevelopment includes apartment buildings not more than four (4) stories tall, most often located on Brush. In the case of the nineteenth century houses located between Woodward and Brush, the two and one half (2 1/2) story height implies more height in feet than usual, since ceiling heights in these houses are unusually high.



PROPORTION OF BUILDING'S FRONT FACADE

Buildings in the district are usually taller than wide; horizontal proportions exist only in incompatible later buildings, except for row house buildings.




PROPORTION OF OPENINGS WITHIN THE FACADE

Areas of void generally constitute between fifteen (15) percent and thirty-five (35) percent of the total facade area excluding roof. Proportions of the **openings themselves are generally taller than wide; in some cases, vertically proportioned units are combined to fill an opening wider than tall.**




RHYTHM OF SOLIDS TO VOIDS IN FRONT FACADE

Victorian structures in the district often **display great freedom in the placement of openings in the facades**, although older examples are generally more regular in such placement than later examples. In later apartments, openings tend to be very regular.




RELATIONSHIP OF MATERIALS

By far the most prevalent material in the district is common brick; other forms of brick, stone and wood trim are common; wood is used as a structural material only east of Brush. Some later buildings have stucco wall surfaces. Originally, roofs were wood or slate with an occasional example of tile; asphalt replacement roofs are common.



RELATIONSHIP OF TEXTURES

The most common **relationship of textures in the district is the low-relief pattern of mortar joints in brick contrasted to the smoother or rougher surfaces** of stone or wood trim. Slate, wood or tile roofs contribute particular textural values where they exist, especially in the case of slates or shingles or other than rectangular shape.




RELATIONSHIP OF COLORS

Brick red predominates, both in the form of natural color brick and in the form of painted brick. **Other natural brick and stone colors are also present. These relate to painted woodwork in various colors**, and there is an occasional example of stained woodwork. Roofs of other than asphalt are in natural colors; older slate roofs are often laid in patterns with various colors of slate. **Original color schemes** for any given building may be determined by professional analysis of the paint layers on the building, and when so determined are always appropriate for that building.



RELATIONSHIP OF ROOF SHAPES

Examples of many roof shapes, including pitched gable roofs, hip roofs, mansard roofs, and gambrel roofs are present. Different types are sometimes combined in a single structure and tower roofs, cupolas, lanterns, belvederes, monitors, conical roofs are used on various Victorian houses. Flat roof areas in the center of hip or mansard roofs are frequent. **Later apartment and commercial buildings generally have flat roofs not visible from the ground.** Generally tall roofs add height to houses of the Victorian period.




WALLS OF CONTINUITY

Between Woodward and Brush, the houses originally honored common setbacks which provided for front lawns. Some of the later apartments have not been set back to the same line as the houses amongst which they were built, thus disturbing the original line of continuity. On Woodward, the **commercial development is typically at the sidewalk, creating a wall of continuity;** this is not entirely continuous due to parking lots and some buildings set well back. On John R. and Brush, and east of Brush, buildings are typically placed at or near the sidewalk with little or no front yard. Where buildings are continuous, a wall of continuity is created.




RELATIONSHIP OF LANDSCAPE FEATURES AND SURFACE TREATMENTS

The major landscape feature of the district is vacant land, which creates a feeling that buildings are missing in the district. Some houses have more than the standard fifty (50) foot lot, and have wide side yards. **Individual houses have front lawns often subdivided by walks leading to the entrance;** lawns are exceedingly shallow or non-existent in the area between Beaubien and Brush. **Side drives are rare, access to garages or coach houses being from the alleys.**




RELATIONSHIP OF OPEN SPACE TO STRUCTURES

There is a large quantity of open space in the area, due to demolition of buildings. The character of this open space is haphazard as it relates to buildings, and indicates the unplanned nature of demolitions due to decline. **The feeling created is that buildings are missing and should be present.** On Watson and Edmund between John R. and Brush, the streets have been removed and replaced with landscaped malls. The traditional relationship of houses to street has thus become a relationship between houses and landscaped strip open space.



SCALE OF FACADES AND FACADE ELEMENTS

In the large houses between John R. and Brush, the scale tends to be large, and the facade elements scaled and disposed to emphasize the large size of the houses. Towers, setbacks, porches and the like divide facades into large elements. On Woodward, the scale ranges from very large, and emphasized by many small window openings, as in the former Detroit Hotel, and very large, made up of large architectural elements, such as the churches, down to quite small, with large windows emphasizing the small size, as in some commercial fronts. East of Brush, the scale is smaller and the detail less elaborate, creating a more intimate setting with the buildings closer to the street. **Later apartments are large in scale with simple but large elements near the ground and repetitive window openings above,** frequently capped by a substantial cornice.



RHYTHM OF BUILDING SETBACKS

Buildings on the **north-south streets generally have little or no setback, while older houses on the east-west streets between Woodward and Brush have some setback,** which varies from street to street, though generally consistent in any one block. Later apartments and commercial structures in the area often ignore the previously established setback. **Between Brush and Beaubien, setback is generally very limited, only a few feet, if any lawn space being provided between sidewalk and building.**




DEGREE OF COMPLEXITY WITH THE FACADES

The older houses in the district are generally characterized by a high degree of **complexity within the facades,** with bay windows, towers, porches, windows and door hoods, elaborate cornices and other devices used to decorate the buildings. Newer houses in the northern end of the district and older houses in the southern end tend to be somewhat simpler than high Victorian structures between them; later apartment and commercial buildings tend to more **classical decorative elements of a simpler kind.**



HamiltonAnderson




GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTER

The environmental character is of an **old urban neighborhood which has undergone, and is undergoing, considerable change.** The original development, reflected in the Victorian period houses, has been altered by the provision of more intensive residential development in the early twentieth century, the change in character of Woodward from residential to commercial at about the same time, and a long period of decline.

HISTORIC (50+ YEARS)



TURN OF THE 21ST C.



TODAY





View from Winder and Brush



RELATIONSHIP OF OPEN SPACE TO STRUCTURES

The building completes a significant and long empty corner that marks a gateway to Brush Park and neighborhoods beyond, with solidly massed facades along Brush and Winder Streets.



WALLS OF CONTINUITY

As a mixed use apartment building at a prominent corner of the neighborhood, the building has minimal setbacks and forms a wall of continuity along Brush and Winder Streets.



LANDSCAPE FEATURES

Landscape Features includes a Pocket Parks leading to the West side apartment entrance.



SCALE OF FACADES

While overall building proportions are horizontal to maintain the street edges, vertical window groupings, window alignments and vertical material panels reinforce verticality.

NOTE:
Background buildings to the right indicate City Modern in the distance. Buildings to the left indicate existing fabric to the West of the site.



BRUSH PARK HISTORIC PALETTE

Utilize palette for accent panels, canopies, and other features. Bronze/black tone windows also in keeping with neighborhood.



FIBER REINFORCED CONCRETE PANEL COLOR

Two contrasting shades to be selected as indicated above.



FIBER REINFORCED CONCRETE PANEL WIDTH VARIATION

Panels to be applied in a rainscreen system with slot venting for P-TAC units. Varied widths (3", 6", and 12" planks) coursed vertically. Retail corner emphasized with change to a darker tone that becomes the primary tone on North and East sides.



DESIGN PROPOSAL - MATERIALS



- Light Gray Concrete Planks Varied Widths and Grit
- Dark Gray Concrete Planks Varied Widths and Grit
- PTAK Venting Strips
- 5' x 7' Metal Window TYP Casement Over Fixed
- 2.5' x 7' Metal Window TYP Casement Over Fixed
- 2.5' x 7' Metal Window TYP Casement Over Fixed

East Elevation



South Elevation




West Elevation Perspective



North Elevation Perspective

MONOCHROME WITH VARIATION - HISTORIC BRUSH PARK



MATERIAL/PALETTE DIAGRAM



PROPORTIONS OF OPENINGS WITHIN THE FACADE
 Areas of void - windows, entries, and storefronts - constitute approximately 35% of the total facade area, consistent with other buildings. Openings are vertically proportioned, sometimes combined with other vertical windows.



RHYTHM OF SOLIDS TO VOIDS IN FRONT FACADE
 Openings are placed in a regular pattern with variation of pace across the length of the facade and integral slotted vents for additional rhythm.

PROJECT: BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS
CLIENT: MHT HOUSING, INC.
LOCATION: 269 WINDER, DETROIT

Scope of Work:

This project is to build a senior living building. The building will be mixed use on the first floor, with retail along Brush Street. The remainder of the first floor will be dedicated to the residential units. Parking for both retail and residents will be provided on site. The first floor will hold the offices, mechanical/utility room, the main community room and 2 ADA public restrooms. The building will be equipped with and elevator and two egress staircases.

Legal Description:

LAND SITUATED IN THE CITY OF DETROIT, COUNTY OF WAYNE, STATE OF MICHIGAN, DESCRIBED AS:

2515 BRUSH - TAX NUMBER: 01000598-604
 LOT 1, EXCEPT THE WEST 9 FEET, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9" AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

291 WINDER - TAX NUMBER: 01000597
 THE WEST 9 FEET OF LOT 1 AND THE EAST 35 FEET OF LOT 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9" AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

N. WINDER - TAX NUMBER: 01000596
 THE WEST 15 FEET OF LOT 2 AND THE EAST 1/2 OF LOT 3, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9" AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

269 WINDER - 01000595.002L
 THE WEST 1/2 OF LOT 3 AND ALL OF LOT 4, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9" AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

ALSO
 LOT 5, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9" AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

THE PERIMETER DESCRIPTION BELOW COMPRISES PARCELS 1 THROUGH 4 AND A PORTION OF PARCEL 5.

LAND IN THE CITY OF DETROIT, WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN BEING ALL OF LOTS 1 THROUGH 4 AND PART OF LOT 5 BLOCK 2 BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9" AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS; AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
 BEGINNING AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE WEST LINE OF BRUSH STREET (60 FEET WIDE) AND THE NORTH LINE OF WINDER STREET (60 FEET WIDE), BEING THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 1; THENCE S59°16'09"W 233.30 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF WINDER STREET; THENCE N30°24'30"W 165.88 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF A PUBLIC ALLEY (20 FEET WIDE); THENCE N59°16'09"E 242.96 FEET ALONG SAID SOUTH ALLEY LINE TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 1 AND THE WEST LINE OF BRUSH STREET; THENCE S27°04'30"E 166.22 FEET ALONG SAID WEST LINE TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING AND CONTAINING 0.907 ACRES.

PROPERTY INFO:
 LOT AREA: 39,501± SF OR 0.907 ± ACRES

BUILDING
 FLOORS: 4
 HEIGHT: _____
 BUILDING FOOTPRINT: 11,368 SF
 BUILDING SIZE: 45,631 SF

APARTMENT UNITS
 6 - STUDIO UNITS
 52 - 1 BEDROOM UNITS
 58 UNITS

USE: MIXED USE - FIRST FLOOR RETAIL & RESIDENTIAL
 SECOND TO FOURTH FLOOR RESIDENTIAL

LOT COVERAGE
 11,536/39,501 = 29%

ZONING DESIGNATION
 PD-H: PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT - HISTORICAL

"LOT DIMENSIONS, SETBACKS, HEIGHT LIMITATIONS, LOT COVERAGE PERCENTAGE AND FLOOR AREA RATIOS SHOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO THE NATURE OF THE PROJECT AND RELATE WELL TO SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT." (Sec. 50-13-122)

RESIDENTIAL DENSITY
 58 UNITS/0.29 ACRES = 200 UNITS PER ACRE

FAR
 BUILDABLE LAND AREA = 39,501 SF
 GROSS FLOOR AREA = 45,631 SF
 FAR = 45,631/39,501
 FAR = 1.16

LEGEND	
⊙	ELECTRIC MANHOLE
⊙	HAND HOLE
⊙	UTILITY POLE
⊙	GAS VALVE
⊙	LIGHT POLE WITH STREET LAMP
⊙	SANITARY MANHOLE
⊙	SQUARE CATCH BASIN
⊙	FIRE HYDRANT
⊙	WATER GATE MANHOLE
⊙	WATER VALVE
⊙	STEAM VAULT
⊙	LIGHTPOST/LAMP POST
⊙	SINGLE POST SIGN
⊙	DECIDUOUS TREE (AS NOTED)
⊙	OVERHEAD UTILITY LINE
⊙	GAS LINE
⊙	SEWER LINE
⊙	WATER LINE
⊙	STEAM LINE

NOTE: ALL UTILITIES SHOWN OUTSIDE THE PROPERTY BOUNDARY ARE EXISTING UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED.


PARKING REQUIREMENTS

PD DISTRICT DESIGN CRITERIA
 "PARKING & LOADING. WHERE APPROPRIATE, ADEQUATE VEHICULAR OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING SHOULD BE PROVIDED. THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WILL BE GUIDED BY STANDARDS DELINEATED IN THIS CHAPTER WITH ADJUSTMENTS APPROPRIATE TO EACH SPECIFIC SITUATION." (Sec. 50-11-15 e)

PROVIDED:	
OFF STREET PARKING -	29 SPACES
ON STREET PARKING* -	9± SPACES
TOTAL -	38 SPACES


SHEET INDEX

ARCHITECTURAL	
ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN	ASP.1
NEIGHBORHOOD SITE PLAN	ASP.2
LANDSCAPE PLAN	LP.1
FLOOR PLANS	A.1.1
ENLARGED UNIT FLOOR PLAN	A.1.2
EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS	A.2.1
EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS	A.2.2
BUILDING SECTION	A.3.1
PHOTOMETRIC PLAN	




ALTA/TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY 1

DUMPSTER DETAIL




WINDER STREET 60' WD.

BRUSH STREET 60' WD.



ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN


SCALE: 1"=20'-0"



ALL UTILITIES ARE TO BE PROPERLY LOCATED BY CIVIL ENGINEER FOR BUILDING PERMITS

STORM WATER RETENTION AREA WILL BE PROPERLY SIZED AND LOCATED FOR BUILDING PERMITS

CLIENT:	MHT HOUSING, INC.
PROJECT:	BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS
LOCATION:	269 WINDER, DETROIT, MICHIGAN
SITE AREA:	39,501± SF OR 0.907 ± ACRES
ARCHITECT:	KEM-TEC & ASSOCIATES
PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTS:	PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS
PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS:	22555 GRATIOT AVENUE
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48205	(586) 772-2222 PHONE
	(586) 772-4048 FAX
APPLICANT:	MHT HOUSING, INC.
ADDRESS:	32600 TELGRAPH RD. #102
	BINGHAM FARMS, MI 48025
	PHONE: 586 833-0550
DRAWN BY:	JFG
SCALE:	1" = 20'-0"
DATE:	11/22/19
PROJECT NO.:	19-03104
SHEET NO.:	ASP.1



NEIGHBORHOOD SITE PLAN
NOT TO SCALE

DRAWN BY: JFG SCALE: 1" = 20'-0" DATE: 11/22/19 PROJECT NO: 19-03104	APPLICANT: MHT HOUSING, INC. 32600 TELGRAPH RD. #102 BINGHAM FARMS, MI 48025 PHONE: 586 833-0550	PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTS PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS KEM-TEC & ASSOCIATES 22555 GRATIOT AVENUE DETROIT, MI 48222 (586) 772-2222 PHONE (586) 772-4048 FAX	CLIENT: MHT HOUSING, INC. BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS 269 WINDER., DETROIT, MICHIGAN SITE AREA: 39,501± SF OR 0.907 ± ACRES	REVISION #1 REVISION #2 REVISION #3	DATE 02-06-2020 DATE 02-13-2020 DATE 02-24-2020	BY M.L./JFG BY M.L./JFG BY JFG	DESCRIPTION PPR MEETING PROJECT REVIEW COMMENTS
---	---	---	---	---	---	--------------------------------------	--

LANDSCAPING NOTES

- THE LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTALLING ALL MATERIALS AND PLANTS SHOWN ON THE PLAN WHETHER OR NOT INCLUDED IN THE "PLANT LIST".
- ALL NURSERY STOCK TO BE WELL BRANCHED, HEALTHY, FULL, VIGOROUS, PRE INOCULATED, AND FERTILIZED. DECIDUOUS TREES TO BE FREE OF FRESH SCARS AND BRANCHES TO BE A HEIGHT OF 5' ABOVE ROOTBALL. TRUNKS SHALL BE WRAPPED, IF NECESSARY, TO PREVENT SUN SCALD AND INSECT DAMAGE. THE LANDSCAPER SHALL REMOVE SAID WRAP AT THE PROPER TIME AS PART OF HIS CONTRACT.
- ALL NURSERY STOCK SHALL BE GUARANTEED.
- TOPSOIL, 4" THICK, SHALL BE PROVIDED AND GRADED BY THE LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR AND SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE OWNER.
- ALTERNATIVES MAY ONLY BE USED IN THE EVENT OF UNAVAILABILITY OF THE SELECTED SPECIES WITHIN A REASONABLE DISTANCE OR DUE TO SEASON. PROOF MAY BE REQUESTED BY THE ENGINEER.
- EVERGREEN TREES SHALL NOT BE PLANTED DURING JUNE, JULY, OR AUGUST.
- MULCH SHALL NOT CONTAIN ANY FARM WASTE AND SHALL BE INDICATED ON PLAN FOR EACH AREA.
- A CHEMICAL WEED PREVENTATIVE BARRIER SHALL BE APPLIED IN ALL NON-GRASS AREAS WHICH DO NOT HAVE POLYETHYLENE FILM MULCH INDICATED.
- REMOVE ALL TWINE, WIRE, AND BURLAP FROM SHRUB AND TREE EARTH BALLS AND FROM TREE TRUNKS.
- LAWN TREES TO BE MULCHED WITH A 2" WIDE BY MINIMUM 6" DEEP SHREDDED BARK RING.
- SHRUB BEDS TO BE MULCHED WITH 3" OF SHREDDED WOOD BARK.
- ALL SOD AND SEED TO BE KENTUCKY BLUE BLEND.

EXAMINATION OF SITE

- THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VISIT THE JOB SITE BEFORE HE SUBMITS HIS BID TO TO BECOME FAMILIAR WITH THE ACTUAL JOB CONDITIONS AND TO CHECK FOR ANY INTERFERENCE BETWEEN THE WORK AND THAT OF OTHER TRADES AND/OR ANY APPARENT VIOLATIONS OF LOCAL OR STATE CODES, LAWS, ORDINANCES, AND REGULATIONS. IF ANY INTERFERENCE OR VIOLATIONS APPEAR AND DEPARTURE FROM THE DESIGN INTENT OF THE CONTRACT DOCUMENT S IS REQUIRED, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER BEFORE ENTERING INTO THE CONTRACT WITH THE OWNER. FAILURE TO PROVIDE THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER WITH THE AFOREMENTIONED NOTIFICATION WILL RESULT IN THE CONTRACTOR BEING HELD RESPONSIBLE TO COMPLETE ALL WORK TO MEET THE INTENT OF THE CONTRACT DRAWINGS WITH NO ADDITIONAL EXPENSE ("EXTRAS") BEING INCURRED BY THE OWNER.

CLEANING

- PREMISES SHALL BE CLEANED UPON COMPLETION OF THE WORK.
- UPON COMPLETION OF THE WORK, THOROUGHLY CLEAN ALL SYSTEMS AND TEST TO INSURE THAT THE SYSTEMS PERFORM TO THEIR REQUIREMENTS.

MAINTENANCE

- THE PROPERTY OWNER WILL TAKE CARE OF THE LANDSCAPING. A LANDSCAPING MAINTENANCE PLAN WILL BE DEVELOPED AS PER ENTERPRISE GREEN COMMUNITIES' REQUIREMENTS PER THE BUILDING AND OPERATIONS MANUAL AND WILL BE PROVIDED AT A LATER DATE.

LANDSCAPING NOTES

- ALL PLANT SIZES SHALL CONFORM WITH DETROIT'S ZONING ORDINANCE.
- MULCH SHALL BE INSTALLED AND MAINTAINED AT A MINIMUM DEPTH OF TWO (2) INCHES AND A MAXIMUM DEPTH OF FOUR (4) INCHES ON ALL PLANTED AREAS.
- ALL UNPAVED AREAS WILL BE COVERED WITH GRASS UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED.
- ALL HEDGES PLACED WITHIN TWENTY (20) FEET OF THE FRONT PUBLIC SIDEWALK SHALL BE LIMITED TO THREE (3) FEET IN HEIGHT ABOVE THE GRADE OF THE PUBLIC SIDEWALK.
- INTERIOR LANDSCAPED AREAS WILL MAXIMIZE EFFECTIVE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT BY AS LISTED WITHIN THE DETROIT ZONING ORDINANCE.


IRRIGATION

- REQUIRED LANDSCAPED AREAS SHALL BE IRRIGATED AS NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN REQUIRED PLANT MATERIALS IN GOOD AND HEALTH CONDITION.
- ALL LANDSCAPED AREAS SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH A READILY AVAILABLE WATER SUPPLY. WATER OUTLETS (HOSE BIBBS) SHALL BE PROVIDED WITHIN ONE HUNDRED (100) FEET OF ALL REQUIRED PLANT MATERIALS UNLESS SUBSURFACE IRRIGATION SYSTEM IS USED AND
- IRRIGATION SYSTEMS SHALL BE CONTINUOUSLY MAINTAINED IN WORKING ORDER AND SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT OVERLAP OF WATER ZONES AND TO PREVENT WATERING OF IMPERVIOUS AREAS.


SITE LIGHTING

- NOTE THAT SITE LIGHTING HAS NOT BEEN PROPERLY DESIGNED AT THIS TIME. A PHOTOMETRIC PLAN WILL BE COMPLETED FOR THE SITE PLAN REVIEW. AFTER THE CITY'S APPROVAL, A LICENSE CIVIL ENGINEER WILL PROPERLY DESIGN THE LIGHT FIXTURE LOCATIONS.

LANDSCAPING CALCULATIONS	
INTERIOR LANDSCAPE	
REQUIRED:	29 OFF STREET PARKING SPACE = 18 SF OF LANDSCAPED AREA
PROVIDED:	29x18 = 522 SF
REQUIRED:	595 SF
PROVIDED:	595 SF
REQUIRED:	1 SHADE TREE FOR EVERY 250 SF
PROVIDED:	595/250 = 3 SHADE TREES
REQUIRED:	4 SHADE TREES
PROVIDED:	4 SHADE TREES
LANDSCAPE AREA	
PROVIDED:	11,798 SF OF LANDSCAPE AREA
REQUIRED:	39,501 PROPERTY SIZE
PROVIDED:	11,798/39,501 = 30% LANDSCAPE AREA



WINDER STREET 60' WD.




ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN


SCALE: 1"=20'-0"

LANDSCAPING SCHEDULE


SYM.	QUANTITY	COMMON NAME	BOTANICAL NAME	SIZE
"A"	17	SHADEMASTER HONEYLOCUST (NO THORNS)	GLEDITSIA TRICANTHOS INERMIS :SHADEMASTER"	2.5" CAL.
"B"	185	YEWE	TAXUS	18" HEIGHT MIN.
"C"	7	WAYFARING TREE	VIBURNUM LANTANA	3'
"D"	6	AMERICAN ARBORVITAE	TSUGA CANADENSIS	4'-5'
"E"	4	DWARF WINGED EUONYMUS	EUONYMUS ALETA COMPACTA	5'-7'



EVERGREEN TREE PLANTING DETAIL
NOT TO SCALE



SHRUB PLANTING DETAIL
NOT TO SCALE



DECIDUOUS TREE PLANTING DETAIL
NOT TO SCALE

CLIENT: MHT HOUSING, INC.
BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS
 269 WINDER., DETROIT, MICHIGAN
 SITE AREA: 39,501± SF OR 0.907 ± ACRES

PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTS
 PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS
 PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS
 22555 GRATIOT AVENUE
 BINGHAM FARMS, MI 48025
 (586) 772-2222 PHONE
 (586) 772-4048 FAX


KEM-TEC & ASSOCIATES

APPLICANT: MHT HOUSING, INC.
 32600 TELGRAPH RD. #102
 BINGHAM FARMS, MI 48025
 PHONE: 586 833-0550


REVISION	DATE	BY	DESCRIPTION
#1	02-08-2020	M.L./JFG	PPR MEETING
#2	02-13-2020	M.L.	PROJECT REVIEW
#3	02-24-2020	JFG	COMMENTS

DRAWN BY: M.L.
 SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"
 DATE: 11/22/19
 PROJECT NO: 19-03104


SHEET NO: LP.1



FIRST FLOOR PLAN
SCALE: 1"=20'-0"




TYPICAL FLOOR PLAN
SCALE: 1"=20'-0"




CLIENT:	MHT HOUSING, INC.		
APPLICANT:	MHT HOUSING, INC. 32600 TELGRAPH RD. #102 BINGHAM FARMS, MI 48025 PHONE: 586 833-0550		
PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTS	KEM-TEC & ASSOCIATES		
PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS			
PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS			
22556 GRATIOT AVENUE			
(586) 772-2222 PHONE			
(586) 772-4048 FAX			
PROJECT NO:	19-03104		
DATE:	11/22/19		
SCALE:	1" = 20'-0"		
DRAWN BY:	JFG		
SHEET NO:	A.1.1		
REVISION #	DATE	BY	DESCRIPTION
#3	02-24-2020	JFG	HDC - COMMENTS
#2	02-13-2020	M.L.	HDC - PROJECT REVIEW
#1	02-06-2020	M.L./JFG	PPR MEETING

BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS
269 WINDER., DETROIT, MICHIGAN
SITE AREA: 39,501± SF OR 0.907 ± ACRES

FLOOR PLANS



TYPICAL 1-BED UNIT FLOOR PLAN
SCALE: 1/2" = 1'-0"



TYPICAL STUDIO UNIT FLOOR PLAN
SCALE: 1/2" = 1'-0"

CLIENT: MHT HOUSING, INC. BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS 269 WINDER., DETROIT, MICHIGAN SITE AREA: 39,501± SF OR 0.907 ± ACRES		#3 02-24-2020 JFG #2 02-13-2020 M.L. #1 02-06-2020 M.L./JFG	#3 02-24-2020 JFG #2 02-13-2020 M.L. #1 02-06-2020 M.L./JFG	HDC - COMMENTS HDC - PROJECT REVIEW HDC - PRR MEETING
PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTS PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS KEM-TEC & ASSOCIATES 22556 GRATIOT AVENUE OAK RIDGE, MI 48227 (586) 772-2222 PHONE (586) 772-4048 FAX		REVISION DATE BY DESCRIPTION		
APPLICANT: MHT HOUSING, INC. 32600 TELGRAPH RD. #102 BINGHAM FARMS, MI 48025 PHONE: 586 833-0550		REVISION DATE BY DESCRIPTION		
DRAWN BY: JFG SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0" DATE: 11/22/19 PROJECT NO: 19-03104	SHEET NO: A.1.2			




EAST ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




SOUTH ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

CLIENT: MHT HOUSING, INC.		MHT HOUSING, INC.	
PROJECT: BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS		BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS	
269 WINDER., DETROIT, MICHIGAN		269 WINDER., DETROIT, MICHIGAN	
SITE AREA: 39,501± SF OR 0.907 ± ACRES		SITE AREA: 39,501± SF OR 0.907 ± ACRES	
REVISION	DATE	BY	DESCRIPTION
#1	02-06-2020	M.L./JFG	PPR MEETING
#2	02-13-2020	M.L.	HDC - PROJECT REVIEW
#3	02-24-2020	JFG	HDC - COMMENTS
PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTS PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS KEM-TEC & ASSOCIATES 22556 GRATIOT AVENUE FARMINGTON HILLS, MI 48334 (586) 772-2222 PHONE (586) 772-4048 FAX			
APPLICANT:	MHT HOUSING, INC.	MHT HOUSING, INC.	
32600 TELGRAPH RD. #102	BINGHAM FARMS, MI 48025	32600 TELGRAPH RD. #102	
PHONE: 586 833-0550		BINGHAM FARMS, MI 48025	
PHONE: 586 833-0550		PHONE: 586 833-0550	
DRAWN BY:	JFG	SCALE:	1/8" = 1'-0"
DATE:	11/22/19	PROJECT NO.:	19-03104
SHEET NO: A.2.1			




WEST ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




NORTH ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

DRAWN BY: JFG		SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"		DATE: 11/22/19		PROJECT NO: 19-03104	
APPLICANT: MHT HOUSING, INC. 32600 TELGRAPH RD. #102 BINGHAM FARMS, MI 48025 PHONE: 586 833-0550		PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTS PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS 22550 GRATIOT AVENUE GRATIOT, MI 48025 (586) 772-2222 PHONE (586) 772-4048 FAX		CLIENT: MHT HOUSING, INC. BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS 269 WINDER., DETROIT, MICHIGAN SITE AREA: 39,501± SF OR 0.907 ± ACRES		REVISION #1 DATE: 02-06-2020 BY: M.L./JFG DESCRIPTION: PPR MEETING	
SHEET NO: A.2.2		KEM-TEC & ASSOCIATES		EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS		HDC - COMMENTS HDC - PROJECT REVIEW HDC - PPR MEETING	




A-A BUILDING SECTION
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



B-B BUILDING SECTION
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

DRAWN BY: JFG		SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"		DATE: 11/22/19		PROJECT NO: 19-03104	
APPLICANT: MHT HOUSING, INC. 32600 TELGRAPH RD. #102 BINGHAM FARMS, MI 48025 PHONE: 586 833-0550		PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTS PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS 22550 GRATIOT AVENUE GRATOT, MI 48030 (586) 772-2222 PHONE (586) 772-4048 FAX		CLIENT: MHT HOUSING, INC. BRUSH PARK APARTMENTS 269 WINDER., DETROIT, MICHIGAN SITE AREA: 39,501± SF OR 0.907 ± ACRES		REVISION	
						#3 JFG	
						#2 M.L./JFG	
						#1	
						DATE	
						BY	
						DESCRIPTION	
						HDC - COMMENTS	
						HDC - PROJECT REVIEW	
						HDC - PPR MEETING	
						DESCRIPTION	



VICINITY MAP
(NOT TO SCALE)

PARKING

NO MARKED PARKING ON SITE.

PARCEL AREA

39,501± SQUARE FEET = 0.907± ACRES

BASIS OF BEARING

SOUTH 27°04'30" EAST, BEING THE SOUTHWESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF BRUSH STREET, AS DESCRIBED.

BENCHMARK

SITE BENCHMARK #1
ARROW ON HYDRANT IN BRUSH STREET RIGHT OF WAY.
ELEVATION = 617.95' (NAVD 88)



SITE BENCHMARK #2
ARROW ON HYDRANT IN WINDER STREET RIGHT OF WAY.
ELEVATION = 616.74' (NAVD 88)

SURVEYOR'S NOTE


THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN HAVE BEEN LOCATED FROM FIELD SURVEY INFORMATION AND EXISTING DRAWINGS. THE SURVEYOR MAKES NO GUARANTEES THAT THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN COMPRISE ALL SUCH UTILITIES IN THE AREA, EITHER IN SERVICE OR ABANDONED. THE SURVEYOR FURTHER DOES NOT WARRANT THAT THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN ARE IN THE EXACT LOCATION INDICATED ALTHOUGH HE DOES CERTIFY THAT THEY ARE LOCATED AS ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE FROM INFORMATION AVAILABLE. THE SURVEYOR HAS NOT PHYSICALLY LOCATED THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES OTHER THAN THE STRUCTURE INVENTORY SHOWN HEREON.

LEGEND

- FOUND MONUMENT (AS NOTED)
- (R&M) RECORD AND MEASURED DIMENSION
- (R) RECORD DIMENSION
- (M) MEASURED DIMENSION
- ⊕ ELECTRIC MANHOLE
- HAND HOLE
- UTILITY POLE
- GAS VALVE
- LIGHT POLE WITH STREET LAMP
- SANITARY MANHOLE
- ⊠ SQUARE CATCH BASIN
- FIRE HYDRANT
- WATER GATE MANHOLE
- WATER VALVE
- STEAM VAULT
- LIGHTPOST/LAMP POST
- SINGLE POST SIGN
- DECIDUOUS TREE (AS NOTED)
- PARCEL BOUNDARY LINE
- PLATTED LOT LINE
- ADJOINER PARCEL LINE
- BUILDING
- CONCRETE CURB
- EDGE OF CONCRETE (CONC.)
- FENCE (AS NOTED)
- WALL (AS NOTED)
- OVERHEAD UTILITY LINE
- GAS LINE
- SEWER LINE
- WATER LINE
- STEAM LINE
- BUILDING HATCH
- CONCRETE HATCH



GRAPHIC SCALE



PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

LAND SITUATED IN THE CITY OF DETROIT, COUNTY OF WAYNE, STATE OF MICHIGAN, DESCRIBED AS:

PARCEL 1:
LOT 1, EXCEPT THE WEST 9 FEET, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

ADDRESS: 2515 BRUSH
TAX NUMBER: 01000598-604

PARCEL 2:
THE WEST 9 FEET OF LOT 1 AND THE EAST 35 FEET OF LOT 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

ADDRESS: 291 WINDER
TAX NUMBER: 01000597

PARCEL 3:
THE WEST 15 FEET OF LOT 2 AND THE EAST 1/2 OF LOT 3, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

ADDRESS: N. WINDER
TAX NUMBER: 01000596

PARCEL 4:
THE WEST 1/2 OF LOT 3 AND ALL OF LOT 4, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

ADDRESS: 269 WINDER
TAX NUMBER: 01000595.002L

PARCEL 5:
LOT 5, BLOCK 2, BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS.

THE PERIMETER DESCRIPTION BELOW COMPRISES PARCELS 1 THROUGH 4 AND A PORTION OF PARCEL 5.

LAND IN THE CITY OF DETROIT, WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN BEING ALL OF LOTS 1 THROUGH 4 AND PART OF LOT 5 BLOCK 2 BRUSH SUBDIVISION OF THAT PART OF THE BRUSH FARM LYING EAST OF AND ADJOINING PARK LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9 AS RECORDED IN LIBER 1, PAGE 118 OF PLATS, WAYNE COUNTY RECORDS; AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE WEST LINE OF BRUSH STREET (60 FEET WIDE) AND THE NORTH LINE OF WINDER STREET (60 FEET WIDE), BEING THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 1; THENCE S59°16'09"W 233.30 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF WINDER STREET; THENCE N30°24'30"W 165.88 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF A PUBLIC ALLEY (20 FEET WIDE); THENCE N9°16'09"E 242.96 FEET ALONG SAID SOUTH ALLEY LINE TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 1 AND THE WEST LINE OF BRUSH STREET; THENCE S27°04'30"E 166.22 FEET ALONG SAID WEST LINE TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING AND CONTAINING 0.907 ACRES.

TITLE REPORT NOTE

ONLY THOSE EXCEPTIONS CONTAINED WITHIN THE OLD REPUBLIC NATIONAL TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY COMMITMENT NO. 704027, DATED NOVEMBER 01, 2019, AND RELISTED BELOW WERE CONSIDERED FOR THIS SURVEY. NO OTHER RECORDS RESEARCH WAS PERFORMED BY THE CERTIFYING SURVEYOR.

2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE MODIFIED DEVELOPMENT PLAN BRUSH PARK REHABILITATION PROJECT, RECORDED IN LIBER 28459, PAGE 602. (SEE DOCUMENT FOR TERMS AND CONDITIONS)

3. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF A RESOLUTION RECORDED IN LIBER 40535, PAGE 209. (SEE DOCUMENT FOR TERMS AND CONDITIONS)

4. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF A RESOLUTION RECORDED IN LIBER 29551, PAGE 1900. (SEE DOCUMENT FOR TERMS AND CONDITIONS)

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATION

TO MHT HOUSING, INC., OLD REPUBLIC NATIONAL TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY AND CINNAIRE TITLE SERVICES, LLC:

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THIS MAP OR PLAT AND THE SURVEY ON WHICH IT IS BASED WERE MADE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 2016 MINIMUM STANDARD DETAIL REQUIREMENTS FOR ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEYS, JOINTLY ESTABLISHED AND ADOPTED BY ALTA AND NSPS, AND INCLUDED ITEMS 2, 4, 5, 7A, 8, 9, AND 11 OF TABLE A, THEREOF. THE FIELD WORK WAS COMPLETED ON DECEMBER 27, 2019.

DATE OF PLAT OR MAP: JANUARY 6, 2020


DRAFT

ANTHONY T. SYCKO, JR., P.S.
PROFESSIONAL SURVEYOR
MICHIGAN LICENSE NO. 47976
22556 GRATIOT AVE., EASTPOINTE, MI 48021
TSycko@kemttec-survey.com

DATE	BY	REVISION	DESCRIPTION
01/06/20	JV		
01/06/20	ATS		
JANUARY 6, 2020			
19-0063			




Kem-Tec, A Group of Companies
Professional Engineering, Surveying & Environmental Services
22556 Gratiot Avenue, Eastpointe, Michigan 48021
Phone: (586) 772-2222 Fax: (586) 772-4048




Site along Winder Road – 10/04/19



Site along Winder Road – 10/04/19



Site along Winder Road – 10/04/19



Site along Winder Road – 10/04/19



Kem-Tec, A Group of Companies
Professional Engineering, Surveying & Environmental Services
22556 Gratiot Avenue, Eastpointe, Michigan 48021
Phone: (586) 772-2222 Fax: (586) 772-4048



Site along Brush Street – 10/04/19



Site along Brush Street – 10/04/19



Site along Brush Street – 10/04/19



Site along Brush Street – 10/04/19



Site along Brush Street and Public Alley – 10/04/19