

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Certificate of Appropriateness
BZH-27877

Date: November 19, 2013

Address of Property: 102 East 19th Street

Project Name: Stevens Community Apartments Entry Doors

Applicant: DKC Properties, Inc.

Contact Person and Phone: Ana Gulinskaya, Miller Hanson Partners (612-332-5420)

CPED Staff: Janelle Widmeier (612-673-3156)

Date Application Deemed Complete: October 17, 2013

End of 60-Day Decision Period: December 16, 2013

Ward: 6 **Neighborhood Organization:** Stevens Square Community Organization

Proposal: Replacement of doors and sidelights at three entrances

Concurrent Review: Certificate of Appropriateness

CLASSIFICATION:	
Local Historic District	Stevens Square Historic District (contributing resource)
Period of Significance	1910s and 1920s
Criteria of Significance	Events, Architecture
Date of Local Designation	1989
Date of National Register Registration	1993
Applicable Design Guidelines	<i>Stevens Square Historic District Design Guidelines</i> <i>The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties</i>

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27877

PROPERTY INFORMATION	
Current name	Stevens Community Apartments
Historic Name	Blackstone
Current Address	102 East 19 th Street
Historic Address	102-108 East 19 th Street
Original Construction Date	1915
Original Architect	None
Original Builder	Anderson & Nelson Construction Co.
Historic Use	Multiple-family residential
Current Use	Multiple-family residential
Proposed Use	No change

HISTORIC BACKGROUND:

The Stevens Square Historic District is mainly comprised of apartment buildings and single-family houses constructed during the 1910s and 1920s. Centered around Stevens Square park, these brick apartment buildings played a significant role in the residential development of Minneapolis before and after World War I. The district is contained within a one and one-half block radius of the park. It is roughly bounded by 17th Street East on the north, Franklin Avenue on the south, 3rd Avenue on the east, and 1st Avenue on the west, including the alley just west of 1st Avenue.

Colonel John Harrington Stevens originally settled on the area now designated as the Stevens Square Historic District in 1849. Colonel Stevens, a veteran of the Mexican War, acquired this land after receiving permission from the U.S. Government to settle west of the Mississippi River, an area later to become the City of Minneapolis. The same year, he built what is popularly believed to be the first house in Minneapolis. The house, however, was moved in 1896 to its present location in Minnehaha State Park. The land on which Stevens Square sits today was given to the City and designated as a park in 1907.

The Stevens Square residential neighborhood was primarily used for farm and nursery land until the late 1880s when it began to be occupied by single-family houses. Growing downtown employment opportunities attracted young, single workers to Minneapolis from the rural areas of Minnesota. The expansion of the streetcar system along Nicollet and 3rd Avenues prompted the further development of the area. Financed by various developers during the 1910s and 1920s, three-story apartment buildings

satisfied the rapidly increasing need for affordable, small-unit housing. By 1919, the Stevens Square area was the highest-density residential area in the city.

The neighborhood is unique because of its remarkable consistency in its housing characteristics, design, and appearance. The apartment buildings themselves are constructed of brown brick with occasional stone, terra cotta, and tile detailing. All of the buildings show an amazing degree of detail in the entries, cornices, and quoining, and have not been considerably altered since their construction. The first large apartment constructed in the area was Stevens Court (128-132 E. 18th St.), in 1912. The district is significant as a total expression of the convergence of development trends, housing markets, design, building regulations, and land available as a result of historical circumstance, at a particular moment in Minneapolis history.

SUMMARY OF APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL:

The replacement doors and sidelights are proposed in three existing entrance openings. The original doors and sidelights were constructed of wood and glass. In late 2012, those were discarded and replaced by the metal doors that are currently installed without obtaining the necessary building permits. Photos of both are attached for reference. The applicant is proposing to replace the unpermitted work with doors and sidelights that are the same as the originals with two exceptions. They would be metal instead of wood and the muntins would be surface applied instead of interstitial. The applicant has indicated that break-ins were a continuous problem with the previous wood doors and that since the metal doors have been installed, the break-ins have ceased. Staff has not been able to confirm this as the number of reported burglaries has not changed significantly according to the Police Incidents Reports. Police Incidents were available between 1999 and 2013. The following information indicates the number of burglaries reported for each corresponding year: 2013 (1), 2012 (2), 2011 (2), 2010 (1), 2009 (1), 2008 (2), 2007 (1), 2006 (0), 2005 (1), 2004 (0), 2003 (0), 2002 (2), 2001 (1), 2000 (1), and 1999 (0).

PUBLIC COMMENT:

A letter from the Stevens Square Community Organization was received and is attached to this report. Staff will forward additional correspondence, if any are received, to the Heritage Preservation Commission.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS: To allow replacement of doors and sidelights at three entrances.

Findings as required by the Minneapolis Preservation Code:

The Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development Department has analyzed the application based on the findings required by the Minneapolis Preservation Ordinance. Before approving a certificate of appropriateness, and based upon the evidence presented in each application submitted, the commission shall make findings based upon, but not limited to, the following:

- (1) The alteration is compatible with and continues to support the criteria of significance and period of significance for which the landmark or historic district was designated.**

Given that the original doors and sidelights have already been removed, the proposed alterations will be compatible with and will support the criteria and period of significance for the building with the adoption of the staff recommendation that the muntins are interstitial.

(2) The alteration is compatible with and supports the interior and/or exterior designation in which the property was designated.

The exterior portions of the building communicate the building's significance. The building is significant for its substantial retention of architectural details and its association with the early growth of the City. The proposed alterations will be compatible with the purpose for designation with the adoption of the staff recommendation that the muntins are interstitial.

(3) The alteration is compatible with and will ensure continued integrity of the landmark or historic district for which the district was designated.

Both the City of Minneapolis' Heritage Preservation Regulations and the National Register of Historic Places identify integrity as the authenticity of historic properties and recognize seven aspects that define a property's integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. Based upon the evidence provided below, the proposed work would impact but not impair the integrity of the landmark.

Location: The applicant is not proposing to change the location of the structure, thus the project will not impair the landmark's integrity of location.

Design: The proposal would not affect the property's ability to reflect its historic function and the building's style. The replacements would match the originals with two exceptions. They would be metal instead of wood and the muntins would be surface applied instead of interstitial. Staff is recommending that the Heritage Preservation Commission require interstitial muntins in the sidelights and that the color matches that of the existing trim accents on the building to lessen the impact on the integrity of design.

Setting: The applicant is not proposing any modifications that would have an impact on the integrity of setting.

Materials: The original entrance materials, which consisted of wood and glass, have been removed. The proposed replacements would be constructed of metal and glass. Allowing metal replacements will affect the integrity of the building and district. Given the history of break-ins and that the proposed replacements are for the most part designed to replicate the originals, staff is not objecting to this alteration.

Workmanship: The removal of the original doors and sidelights resulted in the loss and alteration of distinct decorative and character defining elements on the building and had an impact on the integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: The proposed alterations would not substantially impact the feeling of the building.

Association: The proposed alterations would not have a substantial impact on the integrity of association.

- (4) **The alteration will not materially impair the significance and integrity of the landmark, historic district or nominated property under interim protection as evidenced by the consistency of alterations with the applicable design guidelines adopted by the commission.**

The Heritage Preservation Commission adopted the *Stevens Square Historic District Design Guidelines* in 1988-1989. The guidelines first and foremost call for retaining and preserving original features and clearly state that HPC approval is required for any removal of historic building materials. Given that the original doors and sidelights have already been removed, the following guidelines for entrances apply to this proposal:

Recommended:

- Replacing in kind an entire entrance or porch that is too deteriorated to repair - if the form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.
 - **Recommended design for missing historic features:**
 - Designing and constructing a new entrance or porch if the historic entrance or porch is completely missing. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.

Not recommended:

- Removing or radically changing entrances and porches which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.
- Removing an entrance or porch that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new entrance or porch that does not convey the same visual appearance.
 - **Not recommended design for missing historic features:**
 - Introducing a new entrance or porch that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

Miller Hanson Partners used photographs of the original doors and sidelights in order to replicate the originals in size, proportion, profile and detail. Exceptions to the originals include proposing metal instead of wood and muntins would be surface applied instead of interstitial. Staff is recommending that the muntins be interstitial. With the adoption of the staff recommendation, the replacements will convey the same visual appearance.

- (5) **The alteration will not materially impair the significance and integrity of the landmark, historic district or nominated property under interim protection as evidenced by the consistency of alterations with the recommendations contained in The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.**

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27877

Because the original doors and sidelights have already been removed, the following Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Reconstruction are most applicable to the proposed project:

1. Reconstruction will be used to depict vanished or non-surviving portions of a property when documentary and physical evidence is available to permit accurate reconstruction with minimal conjecture, and such reconstruction is essential to the public understanding of the property.
4. Reconstruction will be based on the accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.
5. A reconstruction will be clearly identified as a contemporary re-creation.

However, the Secretary's Standards do not recommend using substitute materials that do not convey the appearance of the historic building. Even so, allowing metal would clearly distinguish the doors and sidelights as contemporary re-creations. Staff is recommending that the Heritage Preservation Commission require interstitial muntins in the sidelights and that the color matches that of the existing trim accents on the building to lessen the impact on the integrity of design.

- (6) The certificate of appropriateness conforms to all applicable regulations of this preservation ordinance and is consistent with the applicable policies of the comprehensive plan and applicable preservation policies in small area plans adopted by the city council.**

Comprehensive plan preservation policy 8.1 states that the City will, "Preserve, maintain, and designate districts, landmarks, and historic resources which serve as reminders of the city's architecture, history, and culture." Implementation Step 8.1.1 of the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth indicates that the City shall protect historic resources from modifications that are not sensitive to their historic significance.

Miller Hanson Partners used photographs of the original doors and sidelights in order to replicate the originals in size, proportion, profile and detail in order to be sensitive to the historic significance. Exceptions to the originals include proposing metal instead of wood and muntins would be surface applied instead of interstitial. Staff is recommending that the muntins be interstitial and that the color matches that of the existing trim accents on the building. With the adoption of the staff recommendation, the replacements will be consistent with the above policy.

- (7) Destruction of any property. Before approving a certificate of appropriateness that involves the destruction, in whole or in part, of any landmark, property in an historic district or nominated property under interim protection, the commission shall make findings that the destruction is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property, or that there are no reasonable alternatives to the destruction. In determining whether reasonable alternatives exist, the commission shall consider, but not be limited to, the significance of the property, the integrity of the property and the economic value or usefulness of the existing structure, including its current use, costs of renovation and feasible alternative uses. The**

commission may delay a final decision for a reasonable period of time to allow parties interested in preserving the property a reasonable opportunity to act to protect it.

The project does not involve the destruction of the property.

Before approving a certificate of appropriateness, and based upon the evidence presented in each application submitted, the commission shall make findings that alterations are proposed in a manner that demonstrates that the Applicant has made adequate consideration of the following documents and regulations:

- (8) Adequate consideration of the description and statement of significance in the original nomination upon which designation of the landmark or historic district was based.**

Replicating the originals in size, proportion, profile and detail based on photographs indicates consideration of the significance of the district. Metal is proposed instead of wood to address on-going security issues.

- (9) Where applicable, Adequate consideration of Title 20 of the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances, Zoning Code, Chapter 530, Site Plan Review.**

The proposal does not trigger Site Plan Review required by Zoning Code Chapter 530.

- (10) The typology of treatments delineated in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and the associated guidelines for preserving, rehabilitating, reconstructing, and restoring historic buildings.**

As discussed in finding #5 above, the replacements will nearly replicate the originals.

Before approving a certificate of appropriateness that involves alterations to a property within an historic district, the commission shall make findings based upon, but not limited to, the following:

- (11) The alteration is compatible with and will ensure continued significance and integrity of all contributing properties in the historic district based on the period of significance for which the district was designated.**

Given that the original doors and sidelights have already been removed, the proposed alterations will be compatible with and will support the criteria and period of significance for the building with the adoption of the staff recommendation that the muntins are interstitial.

- (12) Granting the certificate of appropriateness will be in keeping with the spirit and intent of the ordinance and will not negatively alter the essential character of the historic district.**

The replacements would match the originals with two exceptions. They would be metal instead of wood and the muntins would be surface applied instead of interstitial. Staff is recommending that the Heritage Preservation Commission require interstitial muntins in the sidelights and that the color matches that of the existing trim accents on the building. With these measures, granting of

the application will be in keeping with the intent of the ordinance and will have little effect on the character of the historic district.

- (13) The certificate of appropriateness will not be injurious to the significance and integrity of other resources in the historic district and will not impede the normal and orderly preservation of surrounding resources as allowed by regulations in the preservation ordinance.**

The request may set a precedent for future cases, but will not formally authorize changes to other Landmarks, Historic Districts, or properties under interim protection without staff or HPC review.

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommendation of the Department of Community Planning and Economic Development for the Certificate of Appropriateness:

The Department of Community Planning and Economic Development recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission adopt the findings above and **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness to allow replacement of doors and sidelights at three entrances located at the property of 102 East 19th Street, subject to the following conditions:

1. The color of the doors and sidelights shall match that of the existing trim.
2. The muntins shall be interstitial.
3. By ordinance, approvals are valid for a period of two years from the date of the decision unless required permits are obtained and the action approval is substantially begun and proceeds in a continuous basis toward completion. Upon written request and for good cause, the planning director may grant up to a one year extension if the request is made in writing no later than November 19, 2015.
4. By ordinance, all approvals granted in this Certificate of Appropriateness shall remain in effect as long as all of the conditions and guarantees of such approvals are observed. Failure to comply with such conditions and guarantees shall constitute a violation of this Certificate of Appropriateness and may result in termination of the approval.
5. Department of Community Planning and Economic Development staff shall review and approve the final plans and elevations prior to building permit issuance.

Attachments:

- Applicant's project description and statement addressing the applicable Certificate of Appropriateness findings
- Correspondence
- Area map
- Plans
- Photos