

**SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
CITY OF SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA  
Lower Level – Room 41, City Hall/Court House, 15 West Kellogg Boulevard  
**April 10, 2014**

---

**Present:** Richard Dana, Robert Ferguson, Renee Hutter, Michael Justin, William Lightner, Amy Meller, David Riehle, Steve Trimble, Diane Trout-Oertel, David Wagner

**Absent:** Barbara Bezat (excused), Matt Hill (excused), Matt Mazanec (excused)

**Staff Present:** Amy Spong, Renee Cohn, John Beaty

---

**BUSINESS MEETING**

- I. **Call to Order** 5:06pm
- II. **Approval of the Agenda** Commissioner Trout-Oertel moved to approve the agenda; Commissioner Hutter seconded the motion.
- III. **Approval of the meeting minutes** Commissioner Trout-Oertel submitted minor corrections. Commissioner Trout-Oertel moved to approve the minutes; Commissioner Trimble seconded the motion.
  - A. March 13, 2014 Business Meeting
  - B. March 27, 2014 Public Hearing
- IV. **Chair's Announcements**
  - A. Chair Dana introduced Amy Meller as a new member to the Commission.
- V. **Staff Announcements**
  - A. Staff discussed the upcoming awards ceremony.
- VI. **Conflicts of Interest** Commissioner Meller recused herself from the public hearing as a working member of the Church of St. Agnes project team.
- VII. **Public Hearing/Design Review**
  - A. **Church of St. Agnes, 548 Lafond Avenue, Heritage Preservation Site**, by Roof Spec, Inc., for a Certificate of Approval for Work, to replace the clay tile and copper roofing with new to match including minor masonry repairs. **File #14-018** (Spong, 266-6714).

Staff read aloud the report recommending conditional approval to replace the clay tile and copper roofing with new to match including minor masonry repairs.

Staff presented photos of the property and discussed drainage issues observed at the site.

Chair Dana inquired as to if there was ever drainage on the front of the building; Mr. Beaty suggested that there was not based on the site visit.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel inquired as to if there are any drawings of the existing drainage system; Mr. Beaty responded that staff is not aware of any.

Chair Dana inquired as to if it is unusual for the application to include alternatives; Ms. Spong responded that it is not.

Commissioner Lightner inquired as to if the alternatives were included for budgetary reasons and suggested that the decision by the Commission may not be feasible; Ms. Spong noted that the Commission is responsible for holding up the guidelines, but may discuss cost with the applicant.

Commissioner Lightner inquired as to if there has been discussion regarding why the built-in gutter were covered; Chair Dana responded that this should be a question for the applicant.

Joel Baresh, Reverend Mark Moriarty, Patrick Menke, and John Ernster were present to discuss the proposal.

Mr. Baresh answered Commissioner Trout-Oertel's questions by stating that there are not previous drawings for the church.

Mr. Baresh discussed Commissioner Lightner's question and staff recommendation No. 1 by presenting historic photos of the site showing the exposed and covered gutters. Mr. Baresh also confirmed that there was never a downspout on the north side and discussed how this led to the failure of the original built-in gutter system.

Ms. Spong requested clarification that the shadow lines being produced are due to the extended gutter, and not an extended roof line and if the shadow line will be increased by the new system; Mr. Baresh suggested that the shadow lines are deceiving and that the roof edge has not changed, but the gutter system is extended.

Mr. Baresh noted that the repair previously thought to have been done in 1956 was actually done in the 1930s. Mr. Baresh and Mr. Ernster presented historic photos and discussed past meeting minutes providing proof of the earlier date of the repairs.

Mr. Baresh noted that installing a new built-in gutter would cost an additional \$250,000 and discussed potential issues with a built-in gutter.

Commissioner Lightner inquired as to if Mr. Baresh has experience with built-in gutters and if they are possible; Mr. Baresh demonstrated knowledge of built-in gutters and re-iterated they potential problems.

Commissioner Hutter inquired as to if the new gutter will be the same size as the current gutter; Mr. Baresh clarified that it will be larger. Commissioner Hutter requested clarification on the proposed color; Mr. Baresh clarified that it is copper.

Chair Dana lead a discussion regarding the expected base bid with the applicants.

Reverend Moriarty discussed the preservation of the church and water issues he has observed.

Ms. Spong requested clarification that the gutters were first repaired in the 1930s, and then again in 1958, and requested clarification of other aspects of the system proposed that will prevent a future replacement sooner than necessary; Mr. Baresh discussed the water issues existing on the site and described the mitigation techniques proposed including insulation and flashing strategies. Ms. Spong and Mr. Baresh discussed the cold roof system and the possibility of ice dams.

Mr. Baresh addressed staff recommendations No. 3-6 and discussed their intentions for various masonry aspects of the site.

Mr. Baresh addressed staff recommendation No. 2 and clarified the reason for proposing the lead-plated copper be installed over the stone.

Chair Dana inquired as to why the lead coated copper has to be installed over the top of the stone; Mr. Baresh continued to discuss the reason for this proposal citing existing and potential water issues.

Ms. Spong noted that there is currently no condition, but the findings and the guidelines suggest that sound original tile be reused; Mr. Baresh responded that there is likely very little sound tile and if any is reused it will be installed on the small roof. Mr. Baresh also noted liability issues with re-using existing tile and warranty issues with the tile company.

Commissioner Dana requested confirmation that they are proposing to not use original tile or the 1950s tile; Mr. Baresh confirmed.

Ms. Spong inquired as to if cleats were considered; Mr. Baresh noted that they are included in the design.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel requested confirmation that the manufacturer would warranty the majority of the roof if the small roofs remain original; Mr. Baresh confirmed.

Chair Dana requested that Mr. Baresh discuss how built-in gutter versus hung gutters would affect the future work to be done on the front of the building; Mr. Baresh responded that hung gutters will allow for more flexibility.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel noted that the proposed downspouts are drawn on the corners, but are not shown on the corner in the photos; Mr. Baresh showed the drawings and photos and clarified where the downspouts are being proposed based on the option chosen.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel inquired as to what scenario would require the downspouts to be in the front; Mr. Baresh responded that downspouts will only need to be on the front if built-in gutters are installed.

Commissioner Riehle inquired as to what company will be building the urns; Mr. Baresh responded that they have not hired anyone yet.

Chair Dana summarized the points to discuss as:

1. If the additional three layers of insulation that will raise the elevation of the roof four inches is acceptable.
2. If the roof can be all new tiles or if some need to be re-used.
3. If the built-in gutter system should be restored or if the hung-gutter is an acceptable alternative.
4. If the roof to wall detail of the flashing being installed over the parapet is OK.
5. A clarification if the metal work can be cut into the stone instead of the joints if the detail was handled this way originally.

Ms. Spong added that there should be further clarification of the masonry details previously discussed.

Mr. Baresh noted the timeline of the project. Commissioner Lightner inquired as to if it is feasible to complete construction before next winter; Mr. Baresh confirmed that it is.

**No written testimony was received and the public hearing was closed.**

Ms. Spong stated that with the new and clarifying information that staff would be more comfortable recommending external hung gutters, but would still not recommend the flashing being installed over the parapets.

Commissioner Riehle requested clarification on the flashing detail; staff clarified which detail this is in reference to on the drawings.

Commissioner Lighter requested clarification on the drawing of the detail being shown; staff clarified this section and discussed the options and clarified what the drawing is representing. A discussion was had regarding what will be visible from the ground.

Chair Dana summarized that the staff recommendation would be accept Option One of the proposal for the external hung gutter.

**Commissioner Riehle moved to accept the applicant's proposal in its entirety and accept the staff report with an amendment to accept the flashing over the parapet; Commissioner Lightner seconded the motion.**

Commissioner Riehle inquired as to if the motions includes accepting all new tile; Chair Dana reiterated the motion as accepting the application with the alternate of hung gutters, that the roof-to-wall detail will be alternate No. 2, the masonry work will be type N or O, reglets will only be cut into the masonry where they are consistent with the original treatment, and that the roof will be increased in height by the thickness of the insulation. Chair Dana noted that this is in contradiction with staff recommendation for the roof-to-wall detail and the roof tiles.

Ms. Spong noted that the recommendation is to explore the possibility of preserving any tiles.

**Commissioner Riehle included in the motion that the applicant has adequately explored the possible preservation of the tiles and that the Commission accepts the complete replacement of the tiles; Commissioner Lightner accepted.**

Commissioner Justin commented that the complete replacement of the tile is acceptable, noting that there would be no visible difference.

Ms. Spong noted that the guidelines state that original fabric should be kept if the material is sound.

Commissioner Hutter stated support of the new tile in consideration of the safety and maintenance issues and overall building preservation.

**The motion passed 7-0 with one abstention (Wagner).**

Commissioner Riehle noted that there is a tamarack tree still standing at the property.

#### **VIII. Committee Reports**

Commissioner Trimble did not present a committee report, but shared with the Commission the newest issue of Minnesota History magazine.

#### **IX. Adjourn 6:45pm**

Submitted by R.Cohn