

**CITY OF SAINT PAUL
HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**

FILE NAME: 445 Smith Avenue North
DATE OF APPLICATION: August 4, 2015 (additional materials 8-11, 8-17, 8-20, 9-15, 9-25)
APPLICANT: Thomas Schroeder
OWNER: Thomas and Ann Schroeder
DATE OF HEARING: August 27, 2015 laid over to October 8, 2015
HPC SITE/DISTRICT: *pending* Limestone Properties Thematic Nomination (P.O.S. 1850-1899)
CATEGORY: Contributing
CLASSIFICATION: Building Permit
STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Amy Spong
DATE: August 19, 2015 October 2, 2015 updates

A. SITE DESCRIPTION:

The Anthony Waldman House at 445 Smith Avenue North was constructed in phases and is classified as contributing to the Limestone Properties Thematic Nomination that is currently pending designation as a Saint Paul Heritage Preservation Site before the City Council (Ord. 15-42). While the property is recognized as significant as a group of uncommon limestone properties within the West Seventh/Fort Road neighborhood constructed during the Pioneer Era, the property is also within a four-block area that has been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

The Waldman House consists of the front stone portion which was constructed by the first owner Charles C. Fuchs circa 1857 and the mason attributed with the craftsmanship is Jacob Amos who moved to St. Paul in 1856. The stone portion is representative of the Federal style with a low sloping hipped roof and a front façade with three bays, sidehall entrance and divided light double hung windows. The sides have fewer openings. The front elevation has an ashlar limestone while the other three sides are of rubble masonry. The circa 1885 rear addition is a wood-frame, 1 ½ story gabled roof structure with wood lap siding and a limestone foundation. According to the applicant, there are earlier framing elements that may date to an earlier structure. The Sanborn Insurance Maps updated through 1925 still show a one story addition with the same footprint as the existing structure. The applicant also provided a photo showing the gabled roof location along the stone wall for the one story structure and wood framing members that were possibly added onto.

The parcel currently has two principle structures located on one lot, the Palmer House was constructed in the 1870s, and according to the applicant, was located behind the Waldman House (alley house) but later moved to the side so that eventually all four dwelling units on the one lot were oriented at the public sidewalk. The Palmer House has been moved off the site. The front stoop of the stone portion is not historic and was added within the last five years by the current owner. The stone came from the façade where the new storefront is located. The stone structure was constructed as a "store" but was used as housing starting in the 1870s through 2008.

B. PROPOSED CHANGES:

The applicant is proposing to rehabilitate the property in order to use the property as a brewery/tap room/restaurant. The applicant proposes to demolish the 1880s wood frame addition and construct a new addition using the same footprint, gable roof with a higher roof pitch, wood lap siding and wood double-hung windows and two dormers. The applicant then proposes two additional additions to the rear including a vestibule and new two-story structure, the brew barn. An accessible ramp is proposed to the south of the stone portion with access in a new side entrance. ~~A side porch is shown in the drawings but is not being proposed or reviewed at this time.~~ The new 1 ¾ story addition that matches the existing footprint of the

1880s addition measures 23' by 18 ½', the one-story vestibule measures 7 ½' by 17' and the new two story building measures 26' by 48'. The historic stone portion will be the only remaining historic fabric on the large parcel and measures 24 ½' wide by 19' deep.

The applicant has submitted a new site plan indicating Options 1 and 2 for accessibility and showing future landscape and patio options that are not being proposed at this time. There are also updated plans for the brew barn addition and vestibule noted as Options 1 and 2. Option 1 includes the plans from the application reviewed by the HPC on August 27th, 2015. There are not changes proposed for Option 1. The vestibule and brew barn were redesigned for Option 2 and include: 1) lowering the wall and eave height but adding 10' to the length. The vestibule was redesigned with glass to be more transparent and the width was reduced from 17' to 14', thereby increasing the setback. There are minor changes submitted for the addition that will replace the 1880s addition: the south facing door and window were moved and the side porch was removed from the plans.

C. BACKGROUND:

The owner purchased the Category 2 Vacant Building from longtime resident and owner, Frances Dreyling in 2008. The owner has been rehabilitating the structure since that time. City permits were issued for re-roofing the stone portion, removing the early stone infill on the main façade and constructing a new storefront, constructing a raised walkway in the public right-of-way, repointing and structural stabilization. Since the property is pending designation by the City Council as a Heritage Preservation Site, there has been no formal review of the work and this staff report only addresses the remaining work being proposed in order to obtain an historic use variance once the property is officially designated.

The Palmer House to the south of the Waldman House has been approved by zoning for moving onto 41 Douglas Street. If the Palmer House is still on the site when the Limestone Properties Thematic Nomination becomes formally adopted (30 days after City Council adoption), the HPC will need to review the removal as a demolition (moving off of a Heritage Preservation Site) per Sec. 74.09(m). This staff report does not address the moving of the Palmer House. Given the construction date, the Palmer House, is during the Period of Significance, the property is considered a contributing element at the site.

Historic Preservation staff attended several meetings during the rehabilitation. The architect and staff met on August 20, 2015 to specifically discuss the needed materials for design review and the public hearing.

The HPC laid over a decision on August 27th in order to convene a design review committee (DRC) to explore revisions to the plans that will meet the applicable standards and guidelines. The DRC was created with Commissioners Ferguson, Trout-Oertel and Wagner. The DRC and staff met with the owner and architect on September 2nd in the City Hall Annex. The agenda and transcribed staff notes of that meeting are included as Attachment 1.

D. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:

Sec. 74.09. Limestone Properties preservation program.

(b) Outline of preservation program. *The City's Legislative Code, Chapter 73 creates the Saint Paul Heritage Preservation Commission and grants powers and duties that include the review of city permits for work at designated sites and districts. Specifically, §73.04(4) states the commission shall protect the architectural character of heritage preservation sites through review and approval or denial of applications for city permits. The following guidelines for design review will serve as the basis for the Heritage Preservation Commission's design review decisions for properties designated under the Limestone Properties Thematic Nomination. The guidelines define the most important elements of the Site's unique physical appearance and state the best means of preserving and enhancing these elements in rehabilitation. Their purpose is to assure that design review will be based on clear standards rather than the tastes or opinions of individual commission members. When applying the guidelines, the Commission,*

in clearly defined cases of economic hardship, will also consider deprivation of the owner's reasonable use of property. Decisions of the Heritage Preservation Commission are subject to appeal to the City Council (§73.06(h)).

(1) General Intent. The city, a certified local government in the National Historic Preservation Program, has agreed to conduct its design review of locally designated heritage preservation sites and districts according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (2014) (The Standards). The Standards are applied to projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility. The Standards provide general information to determine appropriate treatments for historic properties. They are intentionally broad in scope in order to apply to a wide range of circumstances. The Standards have been designed to enhance the understanding of basic preservation principals and may be applied to one historic resource or a variety of historic resource types such as Districts, Sites, Buildings, Structures, and Objects. The Standards identifies four primary treatments: **preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction.** Preservation is defined as the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity and material of an historic property. Improvements generally focus on the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials, rather than extensive replacement or new construction. Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical or cultural value. The Standards for Rehabilitation have been codified in 26 CFR 67. Restoration is defined as the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features and character of a property as it appeared at a particular time by the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period. Reconstruction is defined as the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features and detailing of non-surviving site features for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location. Although there are components that may include restoration and preservation treatments, it is the Standards for Rehabilitation that is emphasized when reviewing proposals. The ten Standards for Rehabilitation are:

- a. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
- b. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
- c. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
- d. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
- e. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
- f. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
- g. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
- h. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
- i. 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.
- j. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

(2) Guidelines for Repair and Rehabilitation of Sites. Although the ways we use buildings have

changed over the years, we can still appreciate the historical and visual values that historic buildings present. To insure that succeeding generations can also appreciate them, the goals of rehabilitation and repair of historic buildings are twofold. The first is to maintain the appearance of age (patina). The second is to maintain the authenticity of the historic building and its materials.

a. Limestone Masonry.

b. Siding and Shingles. *Historic stone buildings may have areas of siding or shingles in gable ends, or there may be wood frame additions on the building that are historically significant. Historic wood materials are of equal importance as masonry, and should be treated accordingly.*

Repair: *Original wood and metal siding and shingles should be retained whenever possible without the application of any surface treatment. A similar material should be used to repair or replace, where necessary. New siding and shingles added to the structure or site should be compatible with the material, color, texture, size, design, and arrangement of the original materials.*

Vinyl, Aluminum and Composite Materials:

Decorative Siding Treatments: *Wooden shingles used for cladding material or decoration, such as in the gable ends, shall be conserved and retained. If replacement is necessary, shingles should replicate the original in material, width, pattern, thickness, profile, texture and weather (lap). Decorative siding treatments, such as paneled patterns used in the gable ends, on bays or around openings shall be retained and repaired. If replacement is necessary, the new shall match in material, size, pattern, profile and texture.*

Painting: *Wood shingles or siding may have been painted or whitewashed for practical and aesthetic reasons. Paint should not be indiscriminately removed from wooden surfaces as this may subject the building to damage and change its appearance. Exterior wooden surfaces shall be maintained with appropriate paint or stain. Color is a significant design element and exterior paint colors should be appropriate to the period and style of the historic building. Building permits are not required for painting, and although the Heritage Preservation Commission may review and comment on paint color, paint color is not subject to Heritage Preservation Commission approval.*

Resources: *The following National Park Service publications contain more detailed information about wood. Preservation Brief #9: The Repair of Historic Wood Windows. Preservation Brief #10: Exterior Paint and Problems on Historic Woodwork. Preservation Brief #17: Identifying the Visual Aspects of Historic Buildings as an Aid to Preserving Their Character. Preservation Brief #32: Making Historic Properties Accessible. Preservation Brief #37: Appropriate Methods for Reducing Lead-Paint Hazards in Historic Housing. Preservation Brief #39: Holding the Line: Controlling Unwanted Moisture in Historic Buildings.*

c. Roofs, Chimneys, Cornices and Parapets.

Roof Structure: *The historic structure of a roof for masonry buildings must be maintained. Truss roofs must not be replaced with rafter roofs, and any horizontal roof members, including tension rods, must not be removed. Masonry walls are weak in tension, and the horizontal thrust of rafters can distort and collapse walls unless the walls are designed to counter the forces.*

Roof Shape: *The original roof type, slope, overhangs and architectural details shall be preserved. The size, shape and original roof features such as dormers, cupolas and parapets shall also be preserved. New roof features may be acceptable if compatible with the original design and not conspicuously located.*

Materials: *When the roof is visible from street level, the original material should be retained if possible, otherwise it should be replaced with new material that matches the old in composition, size, shape, color, and texture. When partially re-roofing, deteriorated roof coverings should be replaced with new materials that match the original in composition, profile, size, shape, color and texture. When entirely re-roofing, new materials which differ to such an extent from the original in composition, size, shape, color or texture that the appearance of the building is altered shall not be used. The predominant roof materials on the residential buildings in the Jacob Schmidt Brewery Historic District are asphalt shingles. When asphalt shingles began to be used in the 1890s and early twentieth century, the most common colors were solid,*

uniform, deep red and solid, uniform, dark green. Dark brown, dark gray and weathered-wood colors may also be acceptable for new asphalt shingles.

Alterations: The roof shape of buildings shall not be altered except to restore it to the original documented appearance. The additions of architecturally compatible elements like dormers may be considered by the HPC on a case-by-case basis. Documentation includes pictorial or physical evidence of the former appearance of the building, or, in the case of pattern book houses, those of similar period and style.

Skylights:

Chimneys, Stovepipes and Smokestacks: Chimneys and smokestacks should be preserved or restored to their original condition. In the absence of historical documentation on the original design, chimney design should be in keeping with the period and style of the building. New chimneys and stovepipes should not be installed on front roof planes.

Cornices, Parapets and Other Details: All architectural features that give the roof its essential character should be preserved or replaced in kind. Similar material should be used to repair/replace deteriorating or missing architectural elements such as cornices, brackets, railings and chimneys, whenever possible. The same massing, proportions, scale and design theme as the original should be retained.

Resources: The following National Park Service publications contain more detailed information about roofs. Preservation Brief #4: Roofing for Historic Buildings. Preservation Brief #19: The Repair and Replacement of Historic Wooden Shingle Roofs Preservation Brief #29: The Repair, Replacement, and Maintenance of Historic Slate Roofs. Preservation Brief #35: Understanding Old Buildings: The Process of Architectural Investigation.

d. Windows and Doors. Windows and doors are a character defining architectural feature of any building, and they establish the visual rhythm, balance and general character of the facades. Any alteration, including removal of moldings or changes in window and door size or type, can have a significant and often detrimental effect on the appearance of the building. It is important to note that in most cases, the historic windows can be affordably repaired and made to perform as well as modern windows. Historic windows that are easily repairable are often replaced at greater cost because homeowners only contact companies that replace windows.

Openings: Existing window and door openings should be retained. New window and door openings should not be introduced into principal or highly visible elevations. New openings may be acceptable on secondary or minimally visible elevations so long as they do not destroy or alter any architectural features and the size and placement is in keeping with the solid-to-void (wall-to-openings) ratio of the elevation. Enlarging or reducing window or door openings to fit stock window sash or new stock door sizes shall not be done.

Panes, Sashes and Hardware:

Trim:

Lintels, Arches and Sills:

Storms and Screens:

Shutters:

Security Measures:

e. Awnings and Canopies:

Resources:

f. Porches and Steps. Porches were a significant part of a house in the nineteenth century and reflected the social development of the US. Porches should be considered one of the most significant architectural features of a building and treated as such.

Preservation: Porches and steps which are historic or appropriate to the building and its development should be retained. Porches and additions reflecting later styles of architecture are often important to the

building's historical evolution and should be retained. Infilling of porches should be avoided. The treatment of historic materials of porches should follow the guidelines for masonry or wood trim above.

Reconstruction: *If porches and steps removed from the building are to be reconstructed, the new work must be based upon photographic documentation, physical evidence, and historical research. Simple designs should be used if evidence is lacking in order to avoid speculation. A professional can help create a design that is compatible in design and detail with the period and style of the building. In replacing porch railings, it is important to maintain the original spacing, section and profile of the balustrades.*

Decorative Features:

Additions and Infill:

Resources:

g. Fencing, Enclosures and Retaining Walls. *Many houses have small walls and other enclosures that are part of the historic fabric of the building site. Existing fencing and retaining walls that are identified as contributing elements to the Site or District should be appropriately maintained and preserved. Mortar should not be added to stone walls that were historically dry-laid (i.e. built without mortar). Otherwise, the elements of walls should be treated as elements of historic buildings.*

h. Mechanical Systems. *Historically, buildings from the frontier era had few amenities. Modern standards of comfort can require the installation of many systems that could disrupt the visual and material integrity of a building. The installation of climate control systems should be carefully considered and designed by professionals. Location and Siting: Mechanical related equipment should be sited in such a way that they do not block or disrupt principal elevations and prominent views, especially on roof tops. Mechanical related equipment that is sited on grade should be inconspicuously sited. In some cases, appropriate screening such as low hedges, may be necessary. Any equipment that must be attached to the exterior of a wall should be done in an unobtrusive location and into mortar joints only. If mechanical attachments, such as water or cooling line sets must cut through a historic masonry wall, the installation should damage as few stones or bricks as possible. It is preferable to extensively damage one stone than to moderately damage four stones. The installation of modern equipment should be carefully planned to avoid damage and removal of historic materials from the interior.*

Grills, Exhaust Fans, etc.: *Grills, vents, exhaust outlets for air conditioners, bath and kitchen exhaust fans should be incorporated into filler panels or exhausted through the roof, if possible. They may be painted the same color as the filler panel.*

Resources: *The following National Park Service publications contain more detailed information about mechanical systems. Preservation Brief #24: Heating, Ventilating, and Cooling Historic Buildings—Problems and Recommended Approaches.*

i. Energy Efficiency.

j. Guidelines for Signage, Awnings and Accessories.

k. Guidelines for New Construction, Additions and Alterations. General. *In general, historic properties should be used as their historic intended purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment. There are cases where small additions or detached new construction will not materially impair the historic or architectural character of the building or its site. New construction can be detached structures on the same property of the historic structure or an addition that is physically attached to the historic structure. Guidelines for new construction focus on general rather than specific design elements in order to allow for architectural innovation. Existing historic buildings and landscape features should be retained and rehabilitated. New construction should reinforce the historic architectural and visual character of the site. The subject of new additions is important because a new addition to a historic building has the potential to change its historic character as well as to damage and destroy significant historic materials and features. A new addition also has the potential to confuse the public and to make it difficult or impossible to differentiate the old from the new or to recognize what part of the historic building is genuinely historic.*

Location. Additions. New construction on the site should not detract from the primary historic building and should be subordinate in massing to the historic structure. Therefore, additions to the primary historic building should be on the rear of the building and visually set back from the side elevations. Proper placement of new detached buildings and even additions require an understanding of the development of the property over time and the surrounding area so that new construction is consistent with historic development patterns. For example, the modest limestone buildings were often built on narrow lots and had small wood-frame accessory structures at the rear or they were built on large lots with multiple dwellings spaced close together. The massing, volume, and height of any new construction should be subordinate to the massing, volume, and height of the existing historic structure on the site. Additions or new buildings on the site that “dwarf” the historic buildings will not comply with these guidelines.

Accessory Buildings. New garages and other accessory buildings should be compatible with the overall design and materials of the existing building on the lot. New garages should be located off rear alleys wherever possible. Garages should not be attached to the front of the building and should only be attached if not visible from the public way.

Parking. Residential parking areas should be confined to the rear of existing or new buildings. Parking spaces should be screened from view from the public street by landscaping such as hedges, grade changes or low fences.

Setback and siting. The setback of new buildings in most residential and commercial areas should be compatible with the setback of existing adjacent historic buildings.

Roofs and Cornices. New roof, and cornice designs should be compatible with the primary building on the site. It is more important for roof and roof edges to relate in size and proportion, than in detailing.

Materials and Details. The materials and details of new construction should relate to the materials and details of the primary building on the site, but should not be slavishly imitative. In other words, new masonry should be mortared to the exterior, but rubble stone construction is not required. Contemporary, cement-backed “dry stone” construction is not appropriate except for retaining walls. Later additions to early modest limestone houses were often wood frame and reflect the changes in materials, economic conditions and trends in architecture. New masonry additions to the limestone buildings are usually not appropriate.

Windows and Doors. Windows, doors, and openings should relate to those of the primary building on the site in the ratio of solid to void, distribution of window openings, and window setback from the exterior wall plane. The proportion, size, style, function and detailing of windows and doors in new construction should relate to that of existing adjacent buildings. Window and door frames should be wood, but imitative materials can be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Resources: The following National Park Service publications contain more detailed information about additions and new construction. Preservation Brief #14: New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns. Preservation Brief #17: Architectural Character—Identifying the Visual Aspects of Historic Buildings as an Aid to Preserving their Character

I. Site Considerations. General. The traditional pattern of streets, curbs, boulevards and sidewalks in the area should be maintained. Distinctive features of spaces in the area such as fences, retaining walls and steps that are important in defining the context should be preserved. The relationship of buildings to open space and setbacks of buildings is important to preserve. New street furniture and landscape improvements such as benches, bus shelters, kiosks, sign standards, trash containers, planters and fences should be compatible with the character of the Sites. The historic urban pattern of grid plan streets should be retained and enhanced in improvement projects.

Fences and Retaining Walls. Fences which are low and allow visual penetration of front yard space are preferable to complete enclosure. Fences of wrought iron or wood which enclose the front yard should be no higher than three and one-half (3 1/2) feet. Cyclone fences should not be used to enclose front yards or

the front half of side yards. Stone, brick and split face concrete block are preferable to landscape timber for the construction of retaining walls.

Lighting. *The location and style of exterior lights should be appropriate to the structure's age and original design intent.*

Hardscaping and Landscaping. *New landscaping should respect the historical and architectural character of the existing property.*

m. Guidelines for Demolition and Moving Buildings. *Proposals for demolishing structures, partial or whole, while reviewed with special care by the Heritage Preservation Commission, are not necessarily in conflict with the guidelines. When reviewing proposals for demolition of structures, the Heritage Preservation Commission will consider the following:*

- 1. The architectural and historical merit of the building. This includes consideration of the integrity of the structure and whether it was constructed during the Period of Significance.*
- 2. The effect of the demolition on surrounding buildings, the effect of any proposed new construction on the remainder of the building (in case of partial demolition) and on surrounding buildings.*
- 3. The economic value or usefulness of the building as it now exists in comparison with the value or usefulness of rehabilitating the building or structure for a new use.*
- 4. The physical condition of the structure and the feasibility of continued use with considerations of maintenance, safety, and compliance with codes.*

E. FINDINGS:

1. The Anthony Waldman House at 445 Smith Avenue North is pending designation as a Saint Paul Heritage Preservation Site under City Council agenda item Ord 15-42 (Legislative Code pending Sec. 74.09). The City's Legislative Code states the HPC shall protect the architectural character of heritage preservation sites through review and approval or denial of applications for city permits for exterior work within designated heritage preservation sites §73.04.(4). The Period of Significance for the Limestone Properties Thematic Nomination is 1850 to 1900.
2. **74.09(1)(a,b,c,d,e,f,i,j) General Intent.** It should be made clear that the new addition onto the stone portion is not a *restoration* or a *reconstruction* as defined by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Those terms were used in the application, but staff and the HPC use the definitions provided in the SOI Standards and repeated in the Preservation Program. The rehabilitation standards and guidelines apply herein and often there are elements that are restored or reconstructed if missing, as part of a larger rehabilitation plan.

There are several Standards that apply to this application that must be evaluated and applied with a general understanding of how the site and buildings have developed and evolved over a long period of time. Throughout this staff report, the rear addition is referred to the 1880s wood frame addition, ~~however, there is indication that the first story may be a much earlier addition with a second floor being added sometime after 1891 (the 1891 Sanborn Insurance Map still shows a one-story building in the same footprint).~~ According to the applicant, there are earlier framing members along the rear stone wall and there is an indication that a lower, one story roof was located here. It's possible the second story of the existing rear addition was installed outside the Period of Significance which goes to 1900. This is further supported by the later 3-over-1 double-hung window in the upper end gable and the shed roof dormer which the applicant believes was installed for the bathroom when plumbing was added.

The applicant is not proposing to restore/reconstruct the earlier one-story wood frame addition noted on the 1891 Sanborn Insurance Map and is also not proposing to reconstruct the existing 1880s addition. The applicant proposes a new addition that is the same footprint

as existing (and likely matches an earlier footprint) with similar materials, such as wood double-hung windows, wood lap siding, stone veneer foundation and wood shingles. The new elements proposed are a taller knee wall (to accommodate more head room in the second story), two new gabled dormers, six awning windows on the second floor, four new 6-over-6 double-hung windows and a brick chimney. This does not generally meet Standard 6 or 74.09 (1)(f) which states, *Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.* There is not enough evidence to reconstruct the one-story addition, but there is enough evidence to reconstruct the existing 1 ½-story addition. The significance and demolition of the rear addition is addressed under Finding 3.

3. **Sec. 74.09(m). Demolition.** The 1880s wood frame portion is being proposed for demolition. Prior to any demolition, partial or whole, the HPC must make findings for the following:

A. The architectural and historical merit of the building. This includes consideration of the integrity of the structure and whether it was constructed during the Period of Significance.

The wood frame addition is considered a *character-defining feature* as it represents the development of the building and site during the Period of Significance (1850 to 1900) and overall development patterns of more modest wood frame additions being added on to masonry buildings. The Standards state: *Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved and The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.* However, the individual elements of the wood frame addition (windows, doors, dormer) are not necessarily *distinctive features, finishes, or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the historic property.* The more distinctive features are the shape, massing, simple detailing (solid-to-void ratio) and how it relates to the masonry portion being sited behind.

The building retains integrity of location as it remains in its original location and the footprint, massing and roof structure has not been altered (~~unless the one-story portion was expanded to add a second floor to increase rental dwelling space~~). Window openings appear in their original configuration but the windows have been replaced with varying muntin patterns. A shed roof dormer is present on the south elevation and its construction date is unknown. There is a limestone foundation, wood lap siding and asphalt shingles.

The 1880s addition does have architectural and historical merit. The exterior also has fair to good integrity, however, the interior is in a gutted state.

B. The effect of the demolition on surrounding buildings, or the effect of any proposed new construction on the remainder of the building (in case of partial demolition) and on surrounding buildings.

The demolition of the 1880s wood frame portion of the building will have a negative effect on the building and on the surrounding neighborhood (CEF NRHP, 1999). The proposed new construction of the addition that will replace the 1880s addition is of a similar massing and form but seeks to mimic ~~Greek Revival~~ elements that are not part of the 1880s addition and will *create a false sense of historical development* which does not comply with SOI Standard under 74.09(1)(c). These elements are the 6-over-6 double hung windows, new awning windows, the more detailed eave returns, and the lower sloping gable roof with less pitch. This will also cover up more of the stone elevation in the back.

During the Design Review Committee Meeting, the architect handed out examples from nearby historic houses that showed where the proposed features came from for the new rear addition. Those neighborhood examples were mostly on historic masonry buildings that were principle structures and not simple rear additions. The items mentioned above create a false sense of historical development by adding conjectural architectural features and elements from other buildings. There was discussion regarding the use of color to better distinguish old from new as well as ways to differentiate detailing from the main stone portion and not pulling elements from nearby buildings.

C. The economic value or usefulness of the building as it now exists in comparison with the value or usefulness of rehabilitating the building or structure for a new use.

This finding is not met as there was no written information provided in the application in order to assess the economic value or usefulness of the building now or if rehabbed for an existing or new use. The application does not provide rehabilitation and adaptive reuse cost estimates for the project as proposed or for the work that has already been completed as there has already been investment in repairing the stone portion and moving the Palmer House off the site. The Housing and Redevelopment Authority approved spending of \$175,780, but the developer ended up only needing \$154,450 to assist with moving, rehabilitation with new foundation, and acquisition of the Charles Palmer House to 41 Douglas Street.

According to Ramsey County Tax and Property Look Up Information for PIN 01.28.23.41.0179, 445 Smith Avenue N., there was no posted sale history of the building. The estimated market values for tax purposes are: 2011=not available, 2012=not available, 2013=not available, 2014=\$144,700 and for 2015=\$146,800. The available numbers were based on a residential non-homesteaded use with no improvements and two residences on one parcel. According to the City permit database, the property became a Category 2 vacant building on August 22, 2008 and the building deficiency inspection letter is attached to give an indication of necessary repair work at the time. A 2012 Code Compliance Inspection report is also included. Both inspections were completed under single-family and duplex housing. According to city permit information, a new roof has been installed on the stone portion, a new storefront and a new stoop that extends the length of the façade have been constructed.

There were no cost estimates provided based on rehabbing the existing building for housing or rehabbing the existing building for a new use without the need for new additions or with the proposed additions, therefore, the economic value of the building if rehabbed for its current use or rehabbed for a new use is unknown. Given the property has been vacant for over one year, the legal non-conforming duplex status of the site would need additional zoning approvals.

D. The physical condition of the structure and the feasibility of continued use with considerations of maintenance, safety, and compliance with codes.

The applicant submitted a structural evaluation and report, and preservation consultant, Bob Frame, provided an additional response to the evaluation. In order to provide a viable use, either updated to residential codes or for a new commercial use, approximately 80% of the existing material would require replacement. The 20% of material that could be salvaged is not all original or early fabric. This report would justify demolition of this character defining feature with the HPC recommending mitigation for the loss of the historic structure. Mitigation could include both documentation and overall reconstruction with minor adjustments to accommodate the new use or a future residential use. For example, an accessible entrance is proposed on the south elevation of the replaced addition. See attached 2008 and 2012 inspection reports per Vacant Category 2 status.

4. **74.09(h) Mechanical Systems.** Venting for a stove in the stone portion appears to be through the existing chimney and venting for the new addition also appears to be through a new chimney. There were no vents shown or proposed for the “barn” addition or condenser units on site. The venting through chimneys complies with the guidelines but there is additional information needed for possible other systems to determine full compliance.
5. **74.09(k). Guidelines for New Construction, Additions and Alterations. General.**

Location. Additions.

Accessible Ramp. An accessible ramp is proposed to the south of the stone portion where the Palmer House is currently sited, but elevations were not provided in order to determine impact to the site and building and appropriateness of access into a secondary entrance not near the main entrance. All options should be fully explored to determine what level of impact to the building and site is appropriate. At least two options to explore include access from the public sidewalk along the alley on the north elevation, and altering the grade to provide an accessible way on the southern lawn area rather than an elevated structure with railings attached to the front raised walkway (non-historic) and near the front stone elevation. Compliance with the guidelines cannot be determined without a grading plan and evaluation of all options to determine the least impact to the historic structure and the site.

This was discussed with the DRC and two new options have been presented but still no elevations or grading plans were submitted. Option 2 is accepted by the Building Official which enters into a side entrance, will follow grade thus reducing the need for a railing, does not result in the loss of historic fabric or negatively impacts the grade and site around the stone portion, and allows for access from the public sidewalk at the front of the property. This entrance is also planned to access future patio (not approved under HUV) and gardens so this is not considered a “back” or “nonprimary” entrance. Option 1 will negatively impact the stone portion and the site conditions immediately around the stone portion. The level of the existing non-historic stoop will also need to be raised slightly to fully meet accessibility requirements into the main door. This will further change the character of the main elevation. The existing non-historic stoop will also be extended around the corner and a non-historic feature will further alter the character of the stone portion and façade. This may also require some railings to meet the existing railings at the stoop. Elevations were not provided. Access on the north side into the rear entrance was explored but not considered an option given there isn’t enough space for a compliant ramp and this entrance is a “back” or “secondary” entrance which isn’t recommended.

Rear Elevation. The location of the rear addition is appropriate as it is at the rear of the stone portion and is smaller and more modest than the stone portion.

Vestibule and Brew Barn Additions. The applicable guidelines and Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation are not met for the vestibule and brew barn additions. The brew barn addition is sited at the rear, however, because it is attached and much larger (footprint and volume/massing) than the stone portion the location does not meet Standard 9 or 74.09(1)(i) which states, *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.*

The guidelines further state, *Proper placement of new detached buildings and even additions require an understanding of the development of the property over time and the surrounding area so that new construction is consistent with historic development patterns. The massing, volume, and height of any new construction should be subordinate to the massing, volume, and height of the existing historic structure on the site. Additions or new buildings on the site that “dwarf” the historic buildings will not comply with these guidelines.*

The guidelines also recommend that new additions be at the rear and *visually set back from the side elevations*. The vestibule and brewing additions are at the rear but are not setback enough so that they appear as “detached” accessory structures. There is a reveal and the vestibule steps down before the height increases again, but the reveal and setback are not substantial enough to meet the intent of the guidelines. The height of the brewing addition is under the stone roof ridge height, however, additions to the rear of stone buildings become smaller and simpler in materials and design. The rear addition and vestibule are smaller and simpler but the brewing addition is increased in height, massing and footprint and is not *subordinate* to the historic stone portion.

A new Option 2 was presented after the DRC met and provided suggestions for alterations. Lowering the eaves of the brew barn was encouraged to lower the overall wall height to bring the massing and scale to be more compatible with the stone portion and new rear addition. This facilitated the footprint of the building increasing from 48’ to 58’ long. While the lowered wall height does substantially help the overall massing, the increased footprint is not compatible with the historic portion and site and negatively impacts the historic character. However, there are details proposed from Option 2 that would soften the presence of the brew barn, such as the new door styles, the removal of second floor windows on the north elevation and the lowered eaves. The increased footprint and overall massing, however, has a greater negative impact than the smaller footprint in Option 1.

The vestibule for Option 2 was changed to be more glass and the footprint was decreased from approximately 17’ to 14’ wide. These changes increase the setback slightly and provide a transparent link to transition from the rear addition to the large brew barn. These changes help to make the brew barn addition appear more detached from the historic stone portion.

Accessory Buildings. The brew barn addition is not a detached accessory building but is designed in a way to make it appear detached and accessory to the main stone portion and new rear addition. The addition is distinguished from the stone portion and replaced rear addition by using board and batten vertical wood siding and by constructing an addition that looks like a barn structure. The guidelines state, *garages should not be attached to the front of the building and should only be attached if not visible from the public way*. The “accessory” additions are visible from the public way given there is a public alley along the side elevation to the north and a large open yard to the south allowing for greater visibility of the new additions. Early structures that were built to house animals during the Pioneer Era were much smaller, detached and located at the back of the lot. This particular lot is not deep but wide and there were four historic principle structures oriented along the main front sidewalk with a few outhouses and very small sheds at the rear of the property as indicated in the 1891 Sanborn Insurance Map. This development pattern represents the long time use of the property as residential, both owner occupancy and rental. There does not appear to have been any structures added for autos even after the Period of Significance as the lot depth and space between the structures limited larger accessory structures.

Parking. Parking for the new use is being provided on a separate parcel across the alley and is not proposed on the site.

Setback and siting. Setback and siting is addressed above in Finding 5. The setback and siting for the new rear addition to the main stone portion complies with the guidelines and the footprint is being matched, but the new ADA ramp (missing elevations), vestibule and brewing additions warrant further siting and setback studies to determine the least impact to the historical and architectural character of the property and site.

The setback and siting of the ADA ramp has been addressed in two new options but the setback for the brew barn addition has not changed. The setback for the vestibule has improved slightly with Option 2.

Roofs and cornices. The new roof pitch of the addition replacing the 1880s addition is not appropriate given the existing addition is considered a contributing or character-defining feature and warrants replicating the existing roof pitch. If a shallower pitch is needed for increased headroom then removing or reducing the new awning windows may be appropriate but allowing for the new dormers (see solid-to-void ration statement under Windows and Doors). A window could be added in the end gable to increase natural light.

Materials and Details. The materials and detailing of the replaced addition should relate to the existing wood frame addition and not to an earlier structure which there is no or little evidence to substantiate a partial reconstruction. The materials of the vestibule and the brewing addition do relate to the existing wood frame addition and the detailing is *differentiated from the old* which meets part of Standard 9 or 74.09 (1)(i) but the brew barn is not compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. Both differentiation and compatibility are needed to meet Standard 9. The revisions in the vestibule in Option 2 do help with “detaching” the brew barn from the historic structure. There are also some detail changes on the brew barn on Option 2 that provide better compatibility, such as the doors and window revisions.

Windows and Doors. The 6-over-6 double hung windows proposed for the replaced addition are not appropriate as they are conjectural and mimic the scale and pattern of the double-hung windows on the earlier stone portion. The solid-to-void ratio or adding several new window openings then what is currently present on the rear addition is also not compatible. Varying the scale and pattern of the new addition’s windows from the stone portion will properly differentiate yet provide compatibility by having some divided light pattern.

6. **74.09(I) Site Considerations. General.**

Fences and Retaining Walls. The applicant may choose to install a fence along the back of the lot but that is not part of this application and must be submitted for review.

Lighting. Exterior lighting was not yet proposed and must be submitted for review.

Signage. Signage is being planned but is not proposed as part of this application.

Hardscaping and Landscaping. Aside from the handicap access ramp and concrete landings, no other hardscaping was proposed at this time but is indicated in the new site plan for purposes of siting the access ramp.

E. The loss of the 1880s wood frame addition will have a negative impact as it is significant in showing the development of the property over time and represents the changing social, architectural and economic conditions during the Period of Significance; however, the structural condition demonstrates that about 80% of the structure would require rebuilding and new material. Mitigation (conditions) can reduce the impact and this can be documentation prior to demolition and reconstructing the overall structure using a similar footprint, roof shape and detailing with similar amounts of solid (siding) to void (windows) in the new addition. Provided appropriate conditions are adopted, the rear addition replacing the existing historic addition will not adversely affect the Program for Preservation and architectural control of the Limestone Properties Thematic Nomination provided the conditions are met (Leg. Code §73.06 (e)).

Option 1 for the accessible ramp will adversely affect the Program for Preservation and architectural control of the Limestone Properties Thematic Nomination while Option 2 will not adversely effect the historic property and site provided the conditions are met. A grading plan and elevations are still required to finalize the design. Every effort should be made to use grading to eliminate the need for railings.

The revised **vestibule** in Option 2 has become more transparent and slightly decreased the width which helps the large massing of the brew barn to “appear” more detached from the historic structure. This vestibule will not have a negative impact provided the conditions are met.

A combination of Options 1 and 2 for the **brew barn addition** will help to mitigate the massing but not fully comply with the Preservation Program and architectural control of the Limestone Properties Thematic Nomination. The DRC made suggestions and the applicant provided two options based on the discussion.

F. STAFF RECOMMENDATION FROM AUGUST 27TH: Based on the findings, staff recommends the HPC lay over a decision in order to convene a smaller design review committee to discuss alternatives to siting, massing, setback, detailing and materials regarding the ADA access, vestibule and brewing additions and appropriateness of replacing the 1880s addition with conjectural elements. A mitigation plan for removing the 1880s addition should also be discussed. Revisions that better meet the Preservation Program and character of the site will then be brought back to the HPC for final decision. The design review committee should include an architectural historian and an historic architect.

UPDATED STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the findings, staff recommends approval of city permit applications provided the following conditions are met:

1. The 1880s addition may be demolished provided the building be documented through as-built drawings and archival-level photos pursuant to the Minnesota Historic Property Record (MHPR). The documentation shall take place prior to any work commencing and two copies shall be submitted to the HPC.
2. *Replacement 1880s addition:* The upper awning windows shall be removed from the plans. A window in the upper end-gable may be added to increase the natural light. The dormer and double-hung windows may have divided lights, however, the lights may not replicate the scale and pattern of the double-hung windows on the stone portion. The trim and siding color shall be the same or close in color value and the color palette of the addition shall be a dark color to contrast with the historic stone.
3. *Brew barn addition and vestibule:* The original footprint of the brew barn shall be constructed with the original wall height or the lowered wall height. The revised doors and windows on the brew barn from Option 2 shall be constructed. The eaves may be lengthened to ‘visually’ lower the overall wall height. Windows on the upper level on the end-gables may be installed to add more natural light. The trim and siding color shall be the same or close in color value and the color palette shall be a dark color to contrast with the historic stone. The vestibule presented in Option 2 shall be constructed. This is the more transparent, glass version with the reduced width. The final detailing and glass patterns will be reviewed and approved by HPC staff. If the interior functions cannot be accommodated within the original footprint and the shortened vestibule then the applicant should consider moving the brewing functions to a completely detached structure on the southern part of the site with a smaller rear addition to house the kitchen and bathrooms required for the taproom.
4. Option 2 for the accessible route shall be selected and carried out. Final stone edging shall be submitted to staff for review and approval and every effort shall be made to eliminate and/or reduce the need for railing by using grade.
5. All final materials and details shall be submitted to HPC staff for final review and approval. All exterior screens shall have a wood flush mount frame with meeting rails to match the sash configuration and be full-frame screens. Screens may also be installed on the interior. The color scheme for the two additions with vestibule shall be dark and monochromatic in order to distinguish old from new and mitigate the large massing of the brew barn. Signage is not included with this application and shall be submitted and reviewed separately.
6. Any revisions to the approved plans must be reviewed and approved by staff and/or the HPC.
7. The HPC stamped approved construction drawings shall remain on site for the duration of the

construction project. When final plans are submitted to DSI, an additional HP staff review is required to assure consistency with HPC reviewed plans and with the conditions.

8. All City Council adopted conditions placed on the Historic Use Variance under City Council RES #15-1604.

G. ATTACHMENTS:

1. Design Review Committee agenda and transcribed notes
2. Updated plans with original Design Review Application and photos
3. 2008 and 2012 Department of Safety and Inspections vacant building reports (via email)