

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CITY OF SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA
Lower Level – Room 41, City Hall/Court House, 15 West Kellogg Boulevard
October 24, 2013

Present: Richard Laffin, Renee Hutter-Barnes, Barbara Bezat, Robert Ferguson, Matt Hill, Michael Justin, William Lightner, Matt Mazanec, Steve Trimble, Diane Trout-Oertel

Absent: Richard Dana (excused), David Riehle (excused), David Wagner (excused)

Staff Present: Amy Spong, Bill Dermody, Renee Cohn, John Beaty

PUBLIC HEARING/DESIGN REVIEW

- I. **Call to Order** 5:04p
- II. **Approval of the Agenda** Commissioner Mazanec requested a discussion of Metro State be added to Old Business.
- III. **Approval of the meeting minutes** This item was continued to the November 7, 2013 Commission meeting.
 - A. October 10, 2013 Business Meeting
- IV. **Conflicts of Interest** None were stated.
- V. **Chair's Announcements** None were stated.
- VI. **Staff Announcements** None were stated at this time.
- VII. **Public Hearings/Design Review**
 - A. **1979 Summit Avenue, Summit West Historic District**, by Renewal by Andersen, for a building permit to replace windows on the front elevation. File #14-001 (Spong, 266-6714)

Staff read aloud the report recommending denial of the application for a building permit to replace windows on the front elevation.

Staff presented photos of the property provided by the applicant and homeowner.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel inquired as to if staff considers the application complete; Ms Spong noted that there are still outlying questions and the application is not complete. Ms. Spong noted the timeline of the incomplete application and stated that this was the reason for bringing the application to the Commission.

Chair Laffin inquired as to the condition of the second floor where there appears to be infill; Ms. Spong stated that staff is unaware of the time period of that alteration.

Russ Miller, the applicant from Renewal by Andersen, was present to speak on behalf of the application.

Mr. Miller introduced himself and described the general process for their application process in regards to the HPC requirements.

Chair Laffin requested clarification on what Mr. Miller referred to as Renewal by Andersen's in-house review process; Mr. Miller clarified that this process happens prior to submission to the HPC.

Chair Laffin inquired as to Mr. Miller's experience with Commissions in other cities; Mr. Miller described these experiences and indicated that there is a level of uncertainty of what needs to be submitted to the HPC.

Chair Laffin suggested that the uncertainty for the materials required may be the cause of the miscommunication with HPC staff; Mr. Miller stated that he would be willing to submit any materials required.

Chair Laffin inquired as to the reason for only replacing six windows and if all would be replaced in the future.

Thomas von Rueden, M.D., the owner of the property, was present to speak on behalf of the application.

Dr. von Reuden responded to Chair Laffin that all of the windows will eventually be replaced.

Commissioner Lightner inquired as to if Mr. Miller understands the materials that are required; Mr. Miller stated that he does. Commissioner Lightner emphasized that photos demonstrating the condition of the windows should also be submitted.

Mr. Miller inquired as to how one might repair the windows; Commissioner Lighter clarified that the demonstration of condition is important to assess whether or not the windows should be repaired or replaced. Dr. von Rueden stated that the windows have not been used since 1985.

Chair Laffin reiterated the guideline cited by staff that repairs is encouraged over replacement and summarized the standards for windows put forth by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Miller stated that he is willing to submit the necessary details for review.

Commissioner Lightner suggested that there be clarification of whether or not the applicant can apply for a window material other than wood, such as Fibrex; Chair Laffin noted that Fibrex has been approved dependent on the specific residence and window design. Chair Laffin also noted the guidelines prefer repair to replacement.

Commissioner Trimble noted that close-up photos are generally provided and the repair of windows depends on the conditions of each window.

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

Commissioner Mazanec motioned to adopt the staff recommendation to deny the current application based on lack of information; Commissioner Hutter-Barnes seconded the motion.

The motion passed 9-0.

Chair Laffin encouraged Mr. Miller to contact staff. Ms. Spong noted that the questions have been emailed to Mr. Miller.

B. ~~79 Western Avenue North, Hill Historic District~~, by Steve Stulz for AT&T, for a permit to install 9 new antennas, a 12 ft. by 20 ft. platform and 10 ft. by 16 ft. equipment shelter on the roof. ~~File #14-002 (Dermody, 266-6715) To be reviewed at the November 7 HPC Public Hearing.~~

C. 1065 Summit Avenue, Hill Historic District, by Willin Consultants Inc. for Sprint, for a permit to install new antennas and telecommunication equipment on the roof. File #14-004 (Boulware, 266-6715)

Staff summarized the report recommending conditional approval of the application for a permit to install new antennas and telecommunication equipment on the roof.

Mr. Dermody noted typographical errors in the staff report and clarified that the building was built outside of the period of significance, but the property is categorized as contributing to the Hill Heritage Preservation District.

Mr. Dermody presented images of the property and mock-up images of the proposed new antennas.

Commissioner Bezat noted the cut and paste technique of the mock-up images and requested clarification of the accuracy of the perspective; Mr. Dermody noted that the perspective represented in the images is not accurate, however the vanishing point from the street has been calculated.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel inquired as to whether the antennas will be visible from other places in the district; Mr. Dermody stated that they would be and noted the changes in visibility depending on the size and side of the building.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel noted that the antennas will be visible no matter the size or location; Mr. Dermody agreed that this is true and noted that the staff recommendation will make the antennas less visible.

John Knappek, a representative of Willin Consultants and Sprint, was present to speak on behalf of the application.

Mr. Knappek clarified that this is not a new facility and is considered a maintenance item by Sprint.

Chair Laffin inquired as to if Sprint considers moving the antennas back acceptable; Mr. Knappek noted that this will impact the coverage objective. Chair Laffin inquired as to who this would impact; Mr. Knappek suggested that it would impact anyone in the coverage area.

Ms. Spong noted that the engineers were evaluating the position proposed by staff; Mr. Knappek noted that these findings had not been received.

Ms. Spong inquired as to if the engineers might potentially suggest that the antennas should be higher if they are moved back; Mr. Knappek confirmed that this is possible.

Commissioner Trimble inquired as to why this specific location has been chosen; Mr. Knappek stated that a gap was identified by Sprint in this area. Mr. Knappek also noted that the system is smaller.

Commissioner Lightner noted that the system is partially existing, but there is currently no antennas in one of the proposed areas; Mr. Knappek described the current system set-up. Mr. Dermody noted that because of directional requirements the existing large antennas are being broken up into three smaller antennas and being repositioned on the roof.

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

Chair Laffin left the meeting and transferred Chair responsibilities to Commissioner Hutter-Barnes.

Commissioner Trimble motioned to adopt staff recommendation to conditionally approve the application; Commissioner Justin seconded the motion.

Commissioner Ferguson requested clarification of the setback issue and whether condition number one is acceptable to the applicant; Commissioner Hutter-Barnes clarified that this is currently unknown.

Commissioner Lightner inquired as to if there is a stipulation to the possibility of increasing the height of the antennas; Mr. Dermody noted that condition number four addresses this situation. Ms. Spong noted that once information is received from the engineer, the height may be reviewed by staff.

Commissioner Lightner inquired as to the possibility of keeping the existing antennas as-is.

Commissioner Hutter-Barnes put the motion on hold and requested that Mr. Knappek address Commissioner Lightner's question.

Commissioner Hill left the meeting.

Mr. Knappek described the visual aggregate reduction of the application and noted the general upgrade of the system.

Commissioner Bezat referred to Commissioner Lightner's question and inquired as to whether the proposed antennas could be clustered; Mr. Knappek stated that they could not. Commissioner Bezat inquired as to if this was an original consideration of the engineers; Mr. Knappek responded that he did not know for certain.

Ms. Spong inquired as to if the antennas could have more separation between them; Mr. Knappek noted that the placement is based on optimal coverage.

Commissioner Mazanec suggested that this decision should be laid over until information is received from the engineers.

Commissioner Trimble withdrew the current motion; Commissioner Justin approved the withdrawal.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel stated agreement with the need for more information from the applicant and suggested proof of exploration to determine if the antenna could be installed in a less obtrusive manner. Mr. Knapek requested clarification of how this would be achieved; Commissioner Trouot-Oertel noted that a report from the engineer and proof that alternatives that have been explored would be acceptable. Ms. Spong summarized questions that arose in the conversation that should be addressed by the applicant.

Commissioner Trimble clarified that the Commission would like the applicant to provide evidence of exploring other options, and not only justifying the original application.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel noted that the elevations of concern should be clarified. Ms. Spong discussed the visibility concerns from the different elevations. Commissioner Bezat noted the potential visual impact to the north elevation.

Commissioner Bezat motioned to layover the decision in order to consider information provided by the engineers; Commissioner Mazanec seconded the motion.

The motion passed 7-0.

VIII. Old Business

A. Commissioner Mazanec presented the intention of Metro State to demolish several three houses on their property. A discussion was had regarding the opportunity to salvage materials from the buildings and the possibilities of moving one or more of the buildings.

B. Commissioner Trimble inquired as to the status of the Ford Plant Showroom. Ms. Spong summarized the status of the Ford Plant Showroom and the Ford site. A discussion was had regarding efforts to preserve elements of the Ford site.

C. Ms. Spong updated the Commission on previous applications reviewed in the Lowertown Historic District and noted that the installation of the alley cobblestones is complete.

IX. Motion to Adjourn 6:20p

Submitted by R.Cohn