

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

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

Absent: Barbara Bezat (excused), Matt Hill (excused), Matt Mazanec (excused), David Riehle (excused), David Wagner (excused)

Staff Present: Amy Spong, Christine Boulware

BUSINESS MEETING

- I. **Call to Order** 5:05 pm
- II. **Approval of the Agenda** Commissioner Trout-Oertel moved to approve the agenda; Commissioner Ferguson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
- III. **Approval of the meeting minutes** Commissioner Trout-Oertel moved to adopt the minutes; Commissioner Hutter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
 - A. June 12, 2014 Business Meeting
 - B. June 26, 2014 Public Hearing
- IV. **Chair's Announcements** None were stated.
- V. **Staff Announcements**
 - A. Staff informed the Commission about the Public Works appeal of the HPC decision regarding the sidewalk at 1173 Davern Street.
 - B. Staff updated the Commission on a meeting that had been had regarding the signage for the Lowertown Ballpark. Staff noted that an update will likely be brought to the Commission.
 - C. Staff discussed a concrete obelisk that served as a mailbox before the current mailboxes were installed.
- VI. **Public Hearing/Design Review**
 - A. **541 Dayton Avenue, Hill Heritage Preservation District**, by owner Mike Schumann, for a building permit to replace windows, vinyl siding and remove the roofs below the dormers. File #14-028 (Boulware, 266-6715)

Staff read aloud the report recommending denial of the proposal to change the size of the windows, to replace original historic windows and to remove the roof sections and overhangs below the dormers, and conditional approval of the proposal to replace the non-historic windows with a historically appropriate window brand and model that is specified by the HPC and owner, and to approve repair of the original wood siding and trim and the replacement of original wood siding and trim with wood or smooth fiber-cement siding that matches the original lap exposure and trim detailing and profiles.

Staff presented photos and maps of the property and the proposal.

Commissioner Lightner requested confirmation that the reason to remove the roof under the dormer is to avoid snow build-up; Ms. Boulware confirmed that this is the reason the applicant proposed.

Commissioner Lightner requested clarification on several items listed in the application and staff report; Ms. Boulware clarified these points and noted that the Commission will be reviewing all of the options listed by the applicant.

Commissioner Lightner suggested that there will be a significant amount of flashing if Hardi-board is installed.

Michael Schumann, the owner, was present to speak on behalf of the proposal.

Mr. Schumann discussed existing issues on the building, the reasons for the elements proposed to be changed, and various aspects of the building that he believes are not original to the property.

A discussion was had regarding elements on the building and when they may have been installed.

Chair Dana inquired as to why Mr. Schumann is not re-using the existing in-swing double door and proposing new French doors; Mr. Schumann noted maintenance issues with the existing doors and suggested that new door would not have these same issues.

Chair Dana suggested that the age of the door could be determined at a site visit and inquired as to if Mr. Schumann would consider installing doors in a similar style; Mr. Schumann replied that he would be willing to look at options.

Mr. Schumann noted that his priority is updating the aesthetics of the building, and not matching what was there historically.

Chair Dana noted that the Commission is concerned with what was there historically and not more modern; Mr. Schumann responded that he intends to make the appearance less modern. Chair Dana and Mr. Schumann discussed appropriate options for doors.

Ms. Spong inquired as to if Mr. Schumann is familiar with the building at 33 Maiden Lane and described the doors that were installed that are appropriate for the district.

Chair Dana inquired as to how much Mr. Schumann knows about the possibility of Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits(HRTC); Mr. Schumann described the process that he has gone through with the National Park Service (NPS) and the process that will continue after the Commission decision. Mr. Schumann noted that some details of the proposal will be dependent on whether HRTCs are received.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel inquired as to if Mr. Schumann will wait until the NPS has made a decision regarding HRTCs; Mr. Schumann confirmed. Commissioner Trout-Oertel suggested that it would make sense for Mr. Schumann to wait to come before the Commission until he has received confirmation regarding HRTCs; Mr. Schumann explained why he has come

to Commission first in case tax credits aren't approved.

Ms. Boulware noted that staff can generally approve plans that have already been approved by NPS. Mr. Schumann explained that he would like the Commission to consider what would be appropriate if HRTCs are not received.

Chair Dana requested confirmation that if HRTCs are not received then the vinyl siding will be left on; Mr. Schumann confirmed that vinyl siding would remain.

Chair Dana requested confirmation that if the Commission does not allow for the roof removal that nothing will be done to them; Mr. Schumann confirmed and noted that he will allow for the building to deteriorate if the Commission does not allow the roof section removal.

Ms. Spong requested confirmation from Mr. Schumann that he has received feedback from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding the repair of the siding that is currently underneath the vinyl siding; Mr. Schuman noted that he had spoken to SHPO who suggested that if he repairs the siding underneath the vinyl that NPS is more likely to approve the project.

Ms. Spong inquired as to if Mr. Schumann had explained the proposal to remove the roof to SHPO and if they had commented on it; Mr. Schumann confirmed that he had spoken to SHPO about it and suggested that they found the proposal reasonable.

Commissioner Hutter noted that it is unlikely that SHPO would approve the removal of the dormer roof.

Commissioner Trimble inquired as to if a test section of the vinyl has been removed to assess the condition of the wood siding; Mr. Schumann noted that the removal of a test section is unnecessary as he had installed the vinyl siding in the 1980s and is aware of the condition of the siding underneath.

Ms. Boulware inquired as to if insulation techniques have been explored at the dormers to control heat issues; Mr. Schumann suggested that insulation is not an option and noted that squirrel infiltration is a problem as well.

Chair Dana suggested that if the awning window is replaced with a clad window that the squirrels will not be able to eat through it; Mr. Schumann responded that there would still be a water problem. Mr. Schumann discussed his intentions to improve the structural functions of the building.

Commissioner Lightner inquired as to if the person who takes care of the sidewalks can also rake the roof; Mr. Schumann replied that raking roofs is not a solution as he lives in Florida during the winter.

Commissioner Meller noted that the removal of a lower section of the dormer roof will also create ice dams and inquired as to if there are other options; Mr. Schumann noted that the proposal will stop icicles from dripping onto the roof and sidewalk.

Chair Dana noted two roof vents and noted that they contribute to ice building-up; Mr. Schumann suggested that ice dams will form regardless.

Chair Dana read aloud the staff recommendation; Ms. Boulware noted the applicant's intent to remove the interior historic doors if the sliding doors are approved.

Chair Dana suggested that a condition be made for staff to examine the siding and the doors to determine a course of action.

Mr. Schumann inquired as to how French doors would be installed if the historic doors are retained; Chair Dana suggested that the design of the historic doors would relate to the design of a new door. Mr. Schumann noted that custom doors are only possible if HRTCs are received.

Mr. Schumann stated that David Jones had sent an email to staff regarding the property; staff replied that they had not received an email. It was determined that the email had been sent to the wrong address.

Ms. Boulware read aloud the email from Mr. Jones stating no objections to the proposal.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Trimble noted hesitancy to vote at this time due to what might change based on NPS approval.

Commissioner Lightner suggested that some direction be provided regarding the roof.

Ms. Spong suggested that a recommendation be made regarding the roof eave, the windows, and the door as the discussion with Mr. Schumann has suggested that these will be changed or replaced whether or not HRTCs are received.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel noted that the applicant would not perform any work without confirmation regarding HRTCs and inquired as to if the Commission approves a certain model if it would have an impact on the decision made by NPS; Ms. Spong responded that the Commission could include a condition that approval is contingent on NPS approval.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel noted that it is premature to make a decision on this application.

Commissioner Meller noted that SHPO is generally more stringent regarding exterior repairs and replacements and suggested that this decision be delayed or that the Commission provides guidance to staff for an in-house review; Ms. Boulware replied that a decision needs to be made tonight in order to comply with the 60 day requirement.

Chair Dana requested that Ms. Boulware clarify the staff recommendation regarding the doors; Ms. Boulware clarified that the removal of the interior of the historic door had not been addressed in the staff report, but should be addressed in the Commission decision.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel moved to deny the application based on staff recommendations and findings; Commissioner Ferguson seconded the motion.

Commissioner Ferguson noted sympathy with the current state of the building and noted disbelief that SHPO would approved removal of the roof sections. He noted that if SHPO were to approve the roof modification that the Commission may be able to approve it, but cannot at this time.

Commissioner Justin supported Commissioner Ferguson's statement and noted the visual change of removing the roof section.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel proposed an amendment to approve the removal of the historic doors with the condition that they be retained in the building and that the sliding glass doors are replaced with a historically approved option.

Ms. Spong noted that it is not possible enforce or require an interior condition and discussed options to require that the historic doors be retained.

Commissioner Hutter noted that the historic doors are hinged on the inside and cannot be removed without Commission approval; Ms. Boulware noted that the doors are within the opening frame.

Commissioner Hutter continued to discuss the doors and suggested approval of an appropriate door replacement.

Commissioner Lightner noted that an in-kind replacement is preferable for the door.

Chair Dana clarified that Commissioner Lightner is suggesting that the historic doors could be removed once an appropriate replacement has been identified; Commissioner Lightner clarified that the specific design could be left to staff discretion.

Commissioner Lightner made a friendly amendment that the doors be replaced with a door of similar style to the historic door with staff approval; Commissioner Hutter seconded the proposal.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel requested that finding No. 8 be addressed regarding the removal of a historic door.

Commissioner Hutter discussed the removal and suggested that the historic doors cannot be repaired to be used in a residential setting, and not a barn.

Commissioner Meller discussed the Secretary of the Interior Standards allows for historically appropriate doors be installed to replace existing features for adaptive reuse projects.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel accepted the friendly amendment; Commissioner Ferguson seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Schumann clarified what had been approved and denied and noted concern with meeting egress code; Ms. Boulware clarified that the current windows may be accepted to meet egress. Mr. Schumann insisted that the current windows do not meet egress code; Ms. Spong noted that the operation of the window can be changed.

VII. Pre-Application Review

A. 321 Irvine Avenue, Hill Heritage Preservation District, by Paula Schad, owner, for preliminary review to construct a new four-level single-family residence with a tuck-under garage. (Spong, 266-6714)

Staff read aloud the staff report, made some clarifications, including some additional information.

Staff presented historic maps, current maps, photos, and drawings of the property and the project.

Commissioner Lightner requested confirmation that the spaces between the properties are vacant; Ms. Boulware noted areas that are vacated and some that are improved.

Several other areas on the maps were clarified to orient the Commission.

Commissioner Lightner inquired as to if the house on the adjacent lot is new construction; Ms. Boulware noted that it is and was reviewed by the HPC, but some of the detailing we see today wasn't approved in that manner.

A discussion was had regarding several properties and buildings visible on the maps.

Bruce Lilly and Paula Schad, the owners, were present to speak on behalf of the projects. Mr. Lilly introduced Shane Coen and David Salmela.

Mr. Coen discussed the current proposal for the landscaping.

Mr. Salmela discussed the reasoning for the design and placement of the garage and the context of the project within the neighborhood.

Mr. Coen discussed the water issues that will be mitigated at the site.

Chair Dana requested expansion on the materials proposed; Mr. Salmela described the reasoning and possible ways in which to combine masonry and stucco.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel inquired as to whether any stone will be used to relate to the ruins in the district; Mr. Salmela responded that stone may be used in the landscaping. Ms. Schad discussed the possible use of stone.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel inquired as to if the intention is to have the residence visible from the street or partially screened; Mr. Salmela noted that it will be integrated and filtered.

Commissioner Lightner inquired as to the area in front of the workshop will be screened; Ms. Schad noted some ideas.

Mr. Lilly noted the desire to have the house and workshop screened from public view.

Commissioner Hutter inquired as to the plinth; Ms. Spong noted that this may be a misnomer. Mr. Salmela noted that this is a flat area that connects to the workshop and will have a chimney. A discussion was regarding this area and the chimney.

Commissioner Hutter encouraged the applicant to explore appropriate window size and proportions for the district, primarily on the Irvine-facing elevation; Mr. Salmela discussed the guidelines that were considered in the design of the building and suggested that there is precedent for the proposed design.

Mr. Salmela suggested that they were encouraged to install double-hung windows and discussed why this is unnecessary; Ms. Boulware clarified that the guideline encourages vertically oriented windows, but not specifically double-hung windows.

Ms. Spong discussed a zoning variance that exists for the property based on a previous proposal, but that this project would require another variance. Ms. Schad described issues in receiving an engineer's report in order to retain a variance. Ms. Spong discussed the process that should take place; Chair Dana noted that there may be another pre-application review after the variance is received.

Commissioner Lightner encouraged the applicant to address the design of the windows and the roof to better relate to the guidelines.

Commissioner Ferguson discussed the massing of the proposal in Finding No.6 and suggested that the finding is not accurate and noted that the guideline for façade openings makes suggestions for sizes, but not requirements.

Commissioner Ferguson discussed the design of the entrances related to the district and guidelines; a discussion was had regarding the entrances in relation to the bluff.

VIII. New Business

A. Commissioner Hutter announced that Ms. Spong and Ms. Boulware will be awarded the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota Award for Stewardship at the upcoming conference.

IX. Committee Reports None were stated.

X. Adjourn 8:21 pm

Submitted by R.Cohn