

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

FILE NAME: 295 Summit Avenue, Unit 3 (Carriage House)

DATE OF APPLICATION: May 2 and July 17, 2013

APPLICANT: Mark Saliterman

OWNER: Mark Saliterman

DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING: August 8, 2013

HPC SITE/DISTRICT: Hill Historic District

CATEGORY: Pivotal

CLASSIFICATION: Demolition Permit

STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Amy Spong

DATE: August 1, 2013

A. SITE DESCRIPTION:

The A.H. Lindeke House at 295 Summit is a two and one-half story red brick Queen Anne with a raised foundation of coursed limestone, and a hipped roof with numerous dormers. The property was designed by A.F. Gauger and built in 1885. An open porch extends across the full width of the main façade. This stone porch replaced a wood porch in 1903 and a central entrance tower was also removed. A two-story cylindrical turret anchors the southwest corner of the building and a canted bay projects from the southeast corner.

The property was originally constructed as a single-family house and then at some point became a meeting house. The house then fell into disrepair and was vacant for several years. Between 2003 and 2006, the HPC reviewed several pre-applications and applications to install an underground garage, turn the main house into three condo units and the carriage house into one unit. Ultimately, a five-stall detached garage was built, the main house has two condo units and the carriage house has one unit. The main house and carriage house also have separate owners and the owner of the carriage house currently rents the unit. The house and carriage house are categorized as pivotal to the Historic Hill District.

B. PROPOSED CHANGES:

The applicant is seeking approval for a demolition permit to raze the brick one-story shed-roof structure at the rear of the carriage house. This was likely used for storing feed and/or deliveries to the property given its proximity to Maiden Lane and the iron access door. The applicant has submitted a drawing of the walls that are proposed for removal. The applicant also submitted: (1) a report from a structural engineer concluding the wall would need to be completely removed and rebuilt, (2) an estimate to completely rebuild the wall salvaging only the face brick for roughly \$80,000, (3) a series of emails from HPC member Richard Dana describing two discussions with masons who both concluded repair of the structure was feasible without taking the whole structure down at a roughly estimated cost between \$20,000 and \$30,000. The application did not include how the remaining masonry would be fixed once the adjoining walls and foundation stone were cut. Drainage and treatment of the site after removal was also not included.

C. BACKGROUND:

In 2007 staff approved two applications (three permits) for work on the carriage house including a complete interior demolition and remodel, tuckpointing and brick repair, trim/fascia/soffit repairs, new gutters, carriage doors, storm doors and windows. The combined state valuation of those permits was \$94,500. It is not clear what, if any work was completed on the brick structure currently proposed for removal. A 2003 photo of this structure shows similar deterioration near the adjacent Germanic Institute building.

In April 2013, HPC staff received a call from a concerned citizen that the wall appeared unstable with the potential to fall. This was during a spring with much snow and rain runoff. Staff then contacted

code enforcement staff in DSI and they visited the site on April 26 to verify the condition, took photos and contacted the property owner to stabilize the structure and fence it off until a permit could be applied for. The property owner installed plywood panels and a fence for interim protection. An incomplete application was submitted to the HPC on May 2 for demolition and staff contacted the owner to provide a structural evaluation and report and explore repair alternatives. The owner then provided a structural report and estimate to rebuild the structure. On June 19, 2013 Ms. Spong, owner Mark Saliterman, and two HPC members Rich Laffin and Richard Dana visited the site to assess its condition and discuss options and next steps. HPC member Dana offered to have two different masons look at the structure to consider repair options. Those visits were completed and Mr. Dana submitted an email to the owner which is included with the application.

D. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:

Historic Hill District Guidelines (1990)

- 1. Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property which requires minimal alteration of the building, structure, or site and its environment, or to use a property for its originally intended purpose.*
- 2. The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.*
- 3. All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.*
- 4. Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure, or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.*
- 5. Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure, or site shall be treated with sensitivity.*
- 6. Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, whenever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.*
- 9. Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property neighborhood, or environment.*
- 10. Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to structures shall be done in such a manner that if such alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.*

Demolition

When reviewing proposals for demolition of structures within the district, the Heritage Preservation Commission refers to Section 73.06 (i)(2) of the Saint Paul Legislative Code which states the following: In the case of the proposed demolition of a building, prior to approval of said demolition, the commission shall make written findings on the following:

- 1) the architectural and historical merit of the building,

- 2) *the effect of the demolition on surrounding buildings,*
- 3) *the effect of any proposed new construction on the remainder of the building (in case of partial demolition) and on surrounding buildings, and*
- 4) *the economic value or usefulness of the building as it now exists or if altered or modified in comparison with the value or usefulness of any proposed structures designated to replace the present building or buildings.*

E. FINDINGS:

1. On April 2, 1991, the Hill Heritage Preservation District was established under Ordinance No. 17815, § 3(II). The Heritage Preservation Commission 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).
2. The property is categorized as pivotal to the character of both the local and National Register Hill Historic Districts.
3. Significant outbuildings such as carriage houses and barns generally contribute to the overall character and integrity of the Historic Hill District. Especially when they date to the original or early construction of the main house and were designed by the architect of the main house or prominent architect of that era as this structure does.
4. Standard number two states: *The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.*
5. *Architectural and historical merit of the building.* The carriage house is considered a pivotal structure that contributes to the architectural and historical merit of the building and surrounding Hill Historic District. The portion of the structure proposed for removal does face Maiden Lane that historically and currently is classified as a street instead of an alley. However, during the Hill District's Period of Significance from 1858 to 1930, Maiden Lane was used mostly for "back of house" functions such as servants use and deliveries.

There is a unique character of this section of Maiden Lane as the clay bricks still survive as the road bed and properties on both sides have brick and stone walls lining much of this stretch. These features collectively represent an earlier era during a time of great affluence and are character-defining features.

The Sanborn Insurance Map updated through 1925 shows the current main footprint of the rectangular carriage house portion but the outline of the structure at the back of the carriage house does not match the current footprint of the back storage structure. Either this area was altered early on or the Sanborn Map was not fully accurate. This storage structure, while integrated with an early or original "bump-out" at the rear does not appear integrated into the original design of the main carriage structure.

6. *Effect of the demolition on surrounding buildings and existing if partial.* If the proposed structure is removed the existing carriage house red brick walls will be exposed and visually, the masonry wall will still continue but be setback further than currently. It does not appear that the existing brick wall which follows Maiden Lane continued and connected to this storage structure.

The effect of removing the three-wythe brick walls that are currently integrated into the carriage house walls is unknown. A detailed repair plan was not submitted as to how the brick and stone/concrete would be cut and then the new building corners repaired in an appropriate way. Simply saw-cutting a joint would be inappropriate. Removal of this storage structure will have little

effect on surrounding buildings.

7. *Effect of any proposed new construction on the remainder of the building (in case of partial demolition) and on surrounding buildings.* There is no proposed new construction however; the new exposed brick wall will require appropriate drainage from the roof and site grading to the alley. Treatment of the brick walls is addressed in finding number 6.
8. *Economic value or usefulness of the building as it now exists or if altered or modified in comparison with the value or usefulness of any proposed structures designated to replace the present building or buildings.*
The applicant submitted property valuation information and earlier Ramsey County records that indicate the value of the new improvements at \$308,000 (2009 and 2010). The current brick storage area is not being used for any purpose. If rehabbed, it could be used as storage space but would likely not impact the value of the structure either way significantly.
9. *Structure's condition.* The applicant submitted a report completed by a structural engineer who concludes the deterioration and partial collapse is due to loss of the foundation integrity along with environmental effects. These were based on visual observations and it was not clear if the engineer had preservation-related experience in evaluating masonry structures. The structure's outer veneer is visibly in very poor condition and there are whole areas that have failed. The structure cannot be left alone with no action being taken. The interior wythe of brick however, appeared fairly stable despite drainage issues.

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the findings, staff recommends approval of the application as submitted provided the following conditions are met:

1. Small-format archival-quality photos (35mm film or high resolution digital format, min. 300 dpi) shall be taken of the structure both inside and outside prior to demolition and after the plywood sheets have carefully and safely been removed. One set of photos will be submitted to the HPC for the file.
2. Prior to approving a demolition permit, a detailed repair plan/scope of work of how the new corners of the laundry room "bump-out" will be repaired, where the connecting walls will be removed. Simply saw-cutting the brick and stone and patching will not be acceptable. This work will be completed by a mason with experience in historic masonry and restoration techniques. Any needed drip edges and site drainage shall also be addressed and submitted to staff for final review and approval.
3. All removed red brick, stone/concrete caps and stone/stone foundation pieces shall be carefully salvaged and cleaned. The red brick and caps shall be placed on pallets and stored in a secure dry place at the property site. These materials shall be used for future repairs needed on the brick wall extending along Maiden Lane.

F. ATTACHMENTS:

1. Application with supporting materials
2. 2003 Schematic drawings and photo of carriage house
3. Sanborn Insurance Map