

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CITY OF SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA
Lower Level – Room 41, City Hall/Court House, 15 West Kellogg Boulevard
February 27, 2014

Present: Barbara Bezat, Richard Dana, Robert Ferguson, Matt Hill, Renee Hutter, Michael Justin, Matt Mazanec, David Riehle, Steve Trimble, Diane Trout-Oertel, David Wagner

Absent: William Lightner (excused)

Staff Present: Amy Spong, Christine Boulware, Renee Cohn, John Beaty

PUBLIC HEARING/ DESIGN REVIEW

- I. **Call to Order** 5:03 PM
- II. **Approval of the Agenda** Commissioner Trout-Oertel moved to approve the agenda; Commissioner Bezat seconded the motion.
- III. **Conflicts of Interest** None were stated.
- IV. **Chair's Announcements** None were stated.
- V. **Staff Announcements**
 - A. Ms. Spong mentioned meeting former Chair Laffin at the Union Depot during President Obama's visit.
 - B. Ms. Boulware announced that the State Historic Preservation Office informed the City of Saint Paul that the Minnesota Milk Company has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
- VI. **Public Hearing/Permit Review**
 - A. **270 West Seventh Street, Irvine Park Heritage Preservation District**, by Jim Berg - DJ's Properties & Development, for a permit to install concrete barriers and fencing at the lot. **File #14-010** (Spong, 266-6714)

Staff read aloud the report recommending conditional approval of the application for a permit to install concrete barriers and fencing at the lot and presented images.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel inquired as to whether there are materials proposed for the raised planter boxes; Ms. Spong responded that the report includes a condition for staff to review and approve the planter boxes. Commissioner Trout-Oertel suggested that railroad ties would not be appropriate; Ms. Spong agreed and discussed appropriate materials (metal, concrete, wood).

Commissioner Trimble suggested that there would have been a more appropriate choice than Jersey barriers, but that staff has recommended approval citing that the owner has already purchased them and inquired as to why this decision was made. Ms. Spong responded that the barriers would not be appropriate for the front of the property, but are being recommended for approval at the rear of the property. Ms. Spong passed around a color photograph of the barriers showing the proposed paint color.

Commissioner Wagner referenced the letter submitted by DSI regarding a complaint made and requested clarification on the origin of the complaint; Ms. Spong responded that it was regarding the wood fence at the duplex, but would need confirmation by the owner. Commissioner Wagner noted that there is no proposal to mediate the complaint

at this time; Ms. Spong responded that a review of the fence will be dependent on what the zoning staff requires.

Commissioner Riehle inquired as to what constitutes a “Jersey” barrier; Ms. Spong described them as relatively temporary with the extended bell shape and showed an image.

Commissioner Wagner inquired as to why this type of barrier was chosen and if it meets the requirements of the historic district guidelines; Ms. Spong responded that she cannot speak for the applicant, but that the barriers would not be appropriate for the front of the property and are only proposed for the rear.

Commissioner Wagner inquired as to whether testimony was received by the adjacent building owners; Ms. Spong responded that none had been received.

Chair Dana clarified that the barriers are proposed to be between the parking lot in question and the adjacent Dairy Queen parking lot; Ms. Spong confirmed.

Jim Berg, applicant and property owner, was present to discuss the proposal.

Mr. Berg discussed the choice of the Jersey barrier, the need for increased public safety, and the need to define the property line between the two parking lots.

Commissioner Wagner asked Mr. Berg if he had considered any other type of barrier and suggested that they look temporary and pedestrian unfriendly; Mr. Berg responded that the intention is to be pedestrian unfriendly and listed other barrier options that were considered and decided against. Commissioner Wagner inquired as to whether a cast-in-place wall had been considered; Mr. Berg responded that it is cost prohibitive.

Chair Dana inquired as to whether the owners of the Dairy Queen will be sharing the cost of the barriers; Mr. Berg responded that they will not be. Mr. Berg discussed past issues with the Dairy Queen owners regarding parking issues.

Ms. Spong presented the site plan that was reviewed and approved in 2002 which included plantings. A fence that was not approved was installed without HPC approval.

Chair Dana inquired as to the status of the current fence; Mr. Berg responded that the fence is in need of some repair. Chair Dana inquired as to whether this is the style of fence that will continue in the proposed areas; Mr. Berg responded that there is an intention to eventually install a more decorative fence. Ms. Spong added that the intention of the condition is for a more substantial or decorative fence.

Chair Dana requested clarification of the sign included in the enforcement notice; Mr. Berg confirmed that it is the sign on the Walnut Street side.

Commissioner Wagner inquired as to how the fence on the duplex side of the property will be addressed in relation to the DSI complaint; Mr. Berg responded that he had a meeting with DSI and zoning staff and was waiting for a response on what is to be required.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel inquired as to the long-term intention for the use of the parking lot; Mr. Berg responded that the intention is to keep it a parking lot.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel inquired as to the width of the driveway; Mr. Berg discussed the width.

Chair Dana requested confirmation that barriers are allowed right up to the lot line per Zoning Code; Mr. Berg confirmed that they are.

Commissioner Wagner inquired as to whether Mr. Berg currently lives in the Irvine Park Historic District; Mr. Berg responded that he does not, but has in the past.

Chair Dana inquired as to whether Mr. Berg is comfortable with the staff conditions and is able to comply; Mr. Berg confirmed that he is and will be able to comply.

Dirk Dantuma, owner of the duplex at 311 Walnut Street, was present and discussed concerns related to the proposed fencing on the property. Mr. Dantuma expressed disapproval of the proposed Jersey barriers.

Ms. Spong requested clarification on the location of the property line in relation to the duplex; Mr. Dantuma confirmed the location of the property line and noted that the parking lot does not continue on to his property.

Commissioner Riehle inquired as to issues related to the property line; Mr. Dantuma responded that there are no issues with the cars in the parking lot crossing the property line.

Chair Dana requested confirmation that Mr. Dantuma's concerns for the fence are not included in this decision; Ms. Spong and Mr. Dantuma confirmed. Mr. Dantuma summarized that he does not approve of the jersey barriers being installed in the parking lot.

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

Commissioner Trout-Oertel moved to deny the application.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel stated belief that a permanent solution should be proposed that better suits the historic district.

Commissioner Trimble seconded the motion.

Chair Dana requested that Commissioner Trout-Oertel refer to staff findings that support denial. Ms. Spong suggested to Commissioner Trout-Oertel that finding number eight supports the motion and that a sentence can be added to address the temporary nature of the type of product; Commissioner Trout-Oertel agreed.

Commissioner Riehle stated that he will vote against the motion, stating reasoning that the parking lot is temporary and the barriers fit the utilitarian needs at hand.

Commissioner Wagner noted that this proposal impacts both commercial and residential properties and should be considered in the decision. Chair Dana noted that this decision is limited to the line between two commercial properties and the residential property is a separate issue; Commissioner Wagner noted the visual impact the barriers will have on the residential property.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel suggested that the applicants' need could be met with a lower-profile, and more permanent solution. Commissioner Wagner requested

confirmation that Commissioner Trout-Oertel is still referring to a solution that does not require a footing; Commissioner Trout-Oertel confirmed.

Commissioner Bezat noted that finding number eight relates to other properties that view the property in question.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel noted disapproval of the solution regardless of the surrounding residential properties.

Commissioner Ferguson noted that the applicant considers this a permanent solutions and stated support of the motion.

The motion passed 6-4 (Hill, Hutter, Mazanec, Riehle).

B. 809 Portland Avenue, Hill Heritage Preservation District, by Kevin Haugtvedt – A Plus Windows, for an **after-the-fact** building permit to replace windows at the property. 26 of the 84 windows were replaced without review and approval or a building permit. **File#14-011** (Beaty, 266-6643)

Staff read aloud the revised report recommending partial and conditional approval of the after-the-fact application for a building permit to replace windows at the property and presented current and past photos of the property.

Chair Dana requested confirmation on the configuration of the front entryway; Ms. Boulware responded that it may have been leaded glass in the transom and this it is unclear what the configuration of the sidelights was.

Commissioner Wagner referenced condition number seven and requested confirmation that staff believes that the removal of the awning would create damage; Ms. Boulware confirmed. Commissioner Wagner inquired as to whether staff would have approved an awning had it been proposed; Ms. Boulware confirmed that they would have if it was an appropriate style.

Commissioner Riehle inquired as to the building construction date; Ms. Boulware responded that they believe that the building was constructed in the early 1920s.

Kevin Haugtvedt, from A Plus Windows, was present and stated that the work completed was without a permit. He noted that the only windows replaced were ones that were not original and that work was stopped when Mr. Haugtvedt was informed that HPC review was required.

Chair Dana inquired as to whether Mr. Haugtvedt had previously done work in St. Paul; Mr. Haugtvedt confirmed that he had. Chair Dana inquired as to whether Mr. Haugtvedt had previously completed work without a permit; Mr. Haugtvedt responded that he had not and stated that he expected the process of receiving a permit to be quick.

Chair Dana inquired as to Mr. Haugtvedt's feelings about the staff recommendations; Mr. Haugtvedt responded that he is concerned about repairing the windows.

Commissioner Wagner inquired as to whether A Plus Windows provides window repair services; Mr. Haugtvedt responded that they do not. Commissioner Wagner noted that historic windows are generally approved to be repaired, and not replaced.

Commissioner Trimble expressed concern with assuming that a building permit could be received quickly and inquired as to whether the building owner had informed Mr. Haugtvedt that the building is in a historic district; Mr. Haugtvedt confirmed that he had not.

Brian Pergament, building owner with Pergola Management, was present and stated that he was not aware that this building is in a historic district. He discussed other experiences with historic properties and window repair or maintenance.

Chair Dana inquired as to the company that completed the front entry replacement; Mr. Pergament stated that it was the Door Glass Company and that a representative was present at the meeting. Chair Dana inquired as to whether Mr. Pergament knew that the front entry work was being completed without a permit; Mr. Pergament responded that he did not.

Chair Dana inquired as to whether Mr. Pergament had repaired historic windows on other properties; Mr. Pergament responded that they have not done full repair before and that his maintenance person suggested that the windows on this property be replaced. Chair Dana inquired as to whether Mr. Pergament had replaced the front windows with an appropriate style had he known it was within the historic district; Mr. Pergament responded that the style of the window was chosen based on his aesthetic preference and an attempt to fit within the perceived neighborhood context.

Commissioner Hutter noted that the issue of the bank not informing purchasers that the building was in a historic district has happened before; Ms. Spong noted that the historic status of a property can be retrieved from the public DSI website.

Commissioner Hutter inquired to Mr. Pergament if he had reviewed the staff recommendations; Mr. Pergament responded that he had, discussed concern with the feasibility of rehabilitating the windows and continuing maintenance, and encouraged the Commission to allow for the windows to continue to be replaced. Mr. Pergament addressed the front entrance, suggested that there is a solution to keep the entrance, and noted that the original transom was divided lights.

Chair Dana responded to Mr. Pergament and clarified that staff is acting on requirements by city code, and not their personal desire. Commissioner Trimble added that staff is fully aware of what it takes to repair windows. Commissioner Wagner noted that staff and the Commission review the repair and conservation of windows on a regular basis and were not given the opportunity to determine with the windows at this property could have been repaired. Mr. Pergament responded that there are many irreparable windows on the property according to the opinion of his maintenance person and requested that the representative from Andersen present possible solutions.

Jay Sandgren, from Andersen Windows, was present and presented the window style that was already used in the building and possibilities to alter the windows to better conform to the district guidelines.

A discussion was had regarding muntin replacement, glass panel replacement, and additional Andersen products that would be more appropriate for the building and the historic district. It was determined that the most appropriate style would require replacement of the existing window sashes.

Harvey Schmidt, with Door Glass, was present and discussed their normal process and the desire to work with staff to make changes to the existing system.

Commissioner Bezat inquired as to the configuration of the historic transom; Mr. Schmidt responded that it was divided lights and likely original. Commissioner Bezat inquired as to how many windows there were and if any were retained; Mr. Schmidt responded that he was unsure of the number of lights and that none were retained.

Commissioner Trimble inquired as to who is responsible for pulling permits for Door Glass; Mr. Schmidt responded that is the individual installer.

Ms. Boulware read aloud a letter from the owners of 805 Portland Avenue expressing support of the window replacements on 809 Portland.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Mazanec moved to approve the building permit per staff recommendations 1-7 and the denial for the installation of the entry system.

Commissioner Mazanec noted that the window and door installers would not have had to attend the Commission hearing had building permits been obtained prior to installation.

Commissioner Trimble seconded the motion.

Commissioner Trimble noted that the motion does not prohibit the owner and applicant to have conversations with staff.

Commissioner Mazanec inquired as to if staff observed any irreparable windows; Ms. Boulware noted a failure of the exterior structure causing damage, but not windows. Ms. Boulware noted that she had only viewed the windows from the interior.

Commissioner Ferguson added that different windows can be in different conditions and referenced the district guideline for window replacement.

Commissioner Wagner noted the unique character of the historic windows on the property.

The motion passed 9-0.

C. 738 Beech Street (rear), Dayton's Bluff Heritage Preservation District, by Steve Mowry, for a building permit to construct four dormers and replace windows and doors. **File #14-012** (Beaty, 266-6643)

Staff read aloud the report recommending approval of the building permit to construct four dormers and replace windows and doors and distributed updated plans submitted by the applicant.

Commissioner Hutter inquired as to whether the front porch is original; Mr. Beaty responded that he is not sure and Ms. Boulware suggested that it was added at a later date.

Steve Mowry, building owner and applicant, was present and discussed the history and current status of the project.

Chair Dana noted the windows and the preference to have them restored; Mr. Mowry discussed the energy efficiency of new windows. Ms. Boulware added that staff has not yet completed a site visit and have not been able to assess the windows.

Commissioner Wagner noted the use of a shed dormer versus and gable dormer and presented a drawing illustrated the difference; Mr. Mowry expressed a dislike of shed dormers, but agreed to consider it. A discussion was had regarding dormer options regarding design, placement, and egress requirements.

Commissioner Hutter inquired as to whether the walkway between the building is a connection between the two buildings; Mr. Mowry responded that it is used as a supply shed and does not open into the houses. Staff noted that it was originally open on one side.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that the barge boards shown in the drawings are not in character with the style of the house; Mr. Mowry noted that this is due to the drafting program and is not the final design proposal.

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

Commissioner Hutter moved to accept the staff recommendation to approve the application with the five conditions; Commissioner Trout-Oertel seconded the motion.

Commissioner Bezat requested confirmation of the construction date of the building; Ms. Boulware confirmed that the construction date is believed to be 1915 or earlier. Commissioner Bezat noted that the shed dormer style is appropriate for the construction date era.

The motion passed 9-0.

D. 716 Wilson Avenue, Dayton's Bluff Heritage Preservation District, by the Saint Paul Housing and Redevelopment Authority, for a demolition permit to raze the Schornstein House. **File #14-013** (Boulware, 266-6715)

Staff read the report recommending denial of the application to demolish the house.

Commissioner Mazanec asked if there were many private owners that apply for demolition because they do not have the funds to complete the project. HPC staff replied that they didn't have numbers to answer that question, but recalled two recent demolition reviews in Dayton's Bluff where one was a Category 3 vacant building and the other was due to extensive fire damage.

Roxanne Young, Housing Project Manager in PED, was present to discuss the proposal and showed recent images of the interior of the property and vandalism. Ms. Young stated that she refutes the finding regarding the Certificate of Occupancy from 2007 and added that it was purchased later that year as part of the Invest Saint Paul initiative. The plan was to hold the property until the market conditions improved. The property has deteriorated since HPC staff walked through it in 2011; the building has been broken into and there has been vandalism. The improvements that had been done in 2006 had all

be undone and it had not been rehabbed to the standards of the program. She further stated that there are water concerns and disagreed with HPC staff adding that the letter from Jeff Garetz regarding the condition of the foundation was sufficient.

Ms. Young stated that this house is an end-cap and that there are buildings around it that do not have the same historic context, thus removing 716 Wilson shouldn't have a negative impact on the neighborhood. She added that she had worked with Dayton's Bluff Neighborhood Housing Services (DBNHS) to try to reduce the cost of the project and that the money proposed to be spent on the property could rehabilitate four other homes. She continued that she cannot recommend rehabilitation due to the amount of funds needed.

Commissioner Trimble asked why this house was different than the Fourth Street houses that were being rehabilitated. Ms. Young stated that the Fourth Street Preservation Project received NSP funding which is gone and now there is a \$150,000 cap per unit subsidy in the Inspiring Communities Program

Commissioner Trout-Oertel asked what would be the minimum that would need to be done to put the property on the market. Ms. Young replied that the building would need to meet the HRA design guidelines which go above-and-beyond the Code Compliance requirements. They could rehab the property for less money, but the HRA won't recommend it; they want the work to meet the standards of a new construction home. Commissioner Trout-Oertel asked if Ms. Young knew the percentage of existing housing that meets the HRA standards. Commissioner Trout-Oertel stated that many houses would not be able to satisfy the HRA requirements and asked if there was something prohibiting the HRA from selling the building so that it could be preserved. Al Carlson, Director of Housing, stated it was purchased with CDBG funds and would need to be sold at or below 80% AMI; the contractor would need to meet Section 3 requirements and be part of the vendor outreach program. He added that the intent of the NSP was to go above the standard and encourage investment. Commissioner Trout-Oertel, Ms. Young and Mr. Carlson discussed the guidelines and which are HRA adopted versus what is federally mandated.

Commissioner Bezat asked what percentage of NSP [HRA] properties are in historic districts. Housing staff did not have a number, but thought 20-30. HPC staff replied that there are twenty-five in the Dayton's Bluff Heritage Preservation District but did not have a number for other districts.

Commissioner Hill asked for verification that there were no plans beyond demolition of the buildings. Mr. Carlson indicated that was correct. Commissioner Hill asked how the demolition proposals correspond with the recent HRA working session. Ms. Young replied that that demolishing the houses would remove slum and blight to create a clear space for a future developer. Commissioner Hill asked why the HRA acquired the property. Ms. Young replied that in 2007 the HRA was in a different position; prior to the market crash, the HRA was reacting to the threat of investors buying the property and going tax forfeit or becoming a vacant building. Commissioner Hill asked if it were safe to say that the intervention failed. Mr. Carlson replied there were a lot of reasons that properties were bought. Some District Councils requested the purchase of certain properties and the HRA purchased the worst-of-the-worst. He questioned if there should be cap exemptions in historic districts and what would be reasonable since these current costs are off the charts. A lot of time and money have been spent at Bates and Wilson and the hydrology alone would cost \$250,000 to address. Ms. Young stated that it is a reasonable expenditure of tax payer money to purchase the properties and demolish t

hem in order to remove problems. She added an example of acquiring 208 Bates due to problem behavior and stated that the Council Member would have spent as much money as necessary to buy it. Commissioner Trimble responded that the situation seemed to be “you got to destroy the village to save it” and added that behavioral problems are the people, not the buildings. Commissioner Trimble asked who sent in the proposal for subsidy to PED. Ms. Young replied, DNBHS submitted the application.

Jim Erchul, director at DNBHS, indicated that they were asked to work on these properties and cited zoning changes from commercial to residential as problematic. Commissioner Trimble asked if Wilson were included in the package to increase the available lot size for more affordable housing, as the application notes the cost of constructing eight units of housing at the site. Ms. Young replied that she completed two analysis of the property that showed if the buildings were removed there could be more density at the site with less cost per unit. The money would be best spent on demolishing the properties to leverage subsidy to create the most number of housing units. Commissioner Trimble discussed “highest and best use” and questioned why it would need to be affordable. Ms. Young replied that it was because the property was purchased with CDBG funds.

Chair Dana asked for the applicant’s reaction to the staff recommendation to deny the application for demolition at the property, but approve the applications at the other two at 208-210 Bates and 216-218 Bates Avenue. Ms. Young replied that she respects the opinion of HPC staff, but disagrees with the recommendation.

Commissioner Wagner asked if the HRA had been aware of hydrology issues when they purchased the property. Ms. Young and Mr. Carlson replied that they couldn’t answer the question, but have had similar circumstances with other properties and had evaluated this property geographically and acquired it due to its proximity to Dayton’s Bluff Elementary. Commissioner Wagner questioned why it was not inspected prior to purchase. Mr. Carlson replied that there had been a walk-through, but there is not always time to have an inspection. Mr. Erchul stated that they had more-or-less inspected the property prior to ownership and at the time, the property was in better condition than it is now. Mr. Erchul replied that the hydrology situation was bad at that time, but when inspected, the sites were grouped together and they addressed the driveway and the off-street parking. Commissioner Wagner indicated that he wanted to know if the foundation issue existed prior to HRA ownership or if it developed after. Jeff Garetz, construction manager, stated that the property had deteriorated since it sat for seven years and what was seen in the 2011 pictures presented by staff is now in a condition that is unsalvageable and much of the interior historic details were vandalized. He continued that the plan was to move the house five feet from the east lot line for clearance and to shore it.

HPC staff clarified items from the letter that was submitted by Mr. Carlson on behalf of Cecile Bedor and stated the staff report did not conclude that 716 Wilson was habitable now given a C of O in 2007. Secondly, the staff report did not state the proposal to move the building and rebuild the foundation are unwarranted, just that materials were not submitted to support rebuilding it if only the house were saved versus rehabilitating all three properties.

There was no one else present to testify, there was no written testimony received. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Mazanec motioned to adopt the staff recommendation and conditions. Commissioner Hill seconded the motion. Commissioner Mazanec stated that empty holes in the neighborhood create blight and erode the community... an empty lot is not a solution and the HRA should reconsider acquiring houses in historic districts if the outcome will be demolition. Commissioner Wagner added that the HRA should be embarrassed. The due diligence was not significant and the HRA sat on the property and allowed it to further deteriorate under their ownership. Commissioner Bezat asked housing staff to consider timelines and to not purchase properties without intent to do the work. She added that disappointing is not a strong enough word for this situation; 2011 photographs showed an intact interior. Commissioner Bezat also informed the “end cap” statement in the letter creates a domino effect as the next house then becomes the “end cap” and so on... it creates a bigger hole. Commissioner Trimble stated that he supports the motion, knows that the property may come down, and that he will be okay with the recommendations for the Bates Avenue properties, but will not vote for them.

The motion passed 7-1(Wagner).

E. 216-218 Bates Avenue, Dayton’s Bluff Heritage Preservation District, by the Saint Paul Housing and Redevelopment Authority, for a demolition permit to raze the Schornstein Garage. **File #14-014** (Boulevard, 266-6715)

Staff read the staff report recommending conditional approval of the demolition permit application and presented images noting areas of deterioration within the building.

Commissioner Trimble requested confirmation as to which properties had been purchased with CDBG funds; Ms. Young confirmed that CDBG funds were used to purchase this property and 716 Wilson Avenue, but not 208-210 Bates Avenue.

Commissioner Trimble noted that Harry Blackman’s (Supreme Court Justice) father owned a grocery store on the end of this block; Ms. Boulevard noted its location on the historic maps.

Ms. Young inquired to staff as to the cost of photo documentation; staff discussed documentation options and indicated that cost is dependent on the method of documentation, and the property type.

Mr. Garetz noted that the removal of the aluminum siding to document the building would necessitate the mitigation of potential lead based paint. Staff asked if demolition of the property would necessitate the mitigation of potential lead based paint as well and Mr. Garetz replied that it would.

Commissioner Trimble inquired as to if the documentation work can be done in-house; staff responded that the City has hired someone in the past and that PED does not have an archival-quality camera.

Commissioner Mazanec inquired whether economic feasibility studies had been done for only 216 Bates Avenue (the two-story section of the property); Ms. Young replied that they had not.

No written testimony was received and the Public Hearing was closed.

Commissioner Bezat moved to approve the staff recommendation with conditions; Commissioner Wagner seconded the motion.

The motion passed 7-1 (Mazanec)

F. 208-210 Bates Avenue, Dayton's Bluff Heritage Preservation District, by the Saint Paul Housing and Redevelopment Authority, for a demolition permit to raze the Schacht Block. **File #14-015** (Boulware, 266-6715)

Ms. Boulware read aloud the report recommending partial and conditional approval of the demolition permit application and presented images noting areas of deterioration within, and on the exterior of the building.

Chair Dana requested that staff elaborate on the possibility of preserving the facade; staff noted that the preservation of a facade only is considered a last resort. Ms. Boulware discussed the HPC approval made in 2012 that would have required replacement of approximately 80% of the building and noted the Penfield project as an example of a facadectomy. Ms. Boulware also noted the importance of preserving the street wall and the pivotal classification of the building.

Commissioner Mazanec requested clarification of the finding that states that demolition would not have an adverse impact on the district; Ms. Boulware clarified that this finding is in reference to the rear portion of the building and requested suggestions for clearer language.

Ms. Young stated concerns about the stabilization and preservation of the facade and discussed the differences with this proposal and the Penfield development citing that:

- There is currently no proposal for development at this site and that development is not estimated to be for 2-4 years.
- The concern for the expense to stabilize the facade and the liability created by keeping the facade in place for the aforementioned amount of time.

Ms. Young also discussed the purchasing situation of this property (in relation to 716 Wilson Avenue and 216-218 Bates Avenue) in which PED was aware of the state of deterioration, noting a Correction Order that was submitted in 1999. She summarized the history of the HRA purchasing the property and noted that since then housing staff has fully explored the possibility of rehabilitation and has determined it to not be possible.

Mr. Garetz opined that most materials on the facade are not original and the only portions worth saving may be the cast iron columns, the stonework, and the dentil work.

Commissioner Wagner sympathized with Mr. Garetz's hesitations, but noted that pieces of the facade could be salvaged through deconstruction, storage, and reconstruction; Ms. Young noted that this request would be more reasonable. Commissioner Wagner requested confirmation that Ms. Young and Mr. Carlson would be open to this idea; Ms. Young and Mr. Carlson confirmed.

Ms. Spong noted the difference between taking down the facade and cataloging the pieces for reconstruction and taking down the facade versus only salvaging some pieces to incorporate into a new design. Commissioner Wagner noted that he would be open to staff working with the HRA to determine how to do this appropriately; Ms. Spong noted

that the condition in the staff report states that the preservation of the facade is to be further explored with an additional plan eventually brought to the Commission, leaving the exploration open to stabilization in place versus deconstruction and reconstruction.

Commissioner Wagner noted that stabilizing the facade in place would be impractical.

Chair Dana elaborated that stabilization could be studied, and if it's impractical, then the applicant would return to the Commission with evidence and new solutions.

Mr. Garetz showed that he currently has architectural drawings for the building, and noted that the 2012 plans included the preservation of the facade.

Commissioner Mazanec opined that this is an important building on this block and cannot vote to allow its demolition. He noted that if there are no plans for 2-3 years, then demolition should not be proposed until that time.

No written testimony was received and the Public Hearing was closed.

Commissioner Wagner moved to adopt the staff recommendation with an addition in language that would be to stabilize, retain, and restore the facade of the building for incorporation into future construction at the property, but that stabilization does not need to occur in-situ but can be stored off site; Commissioner Bezat seconded the motion.

Commissioner Trimble commented on whether this type of demolition would occur in the Historic Hill Heritage Preservation District and discussed the likelihood of affordable housing being developed on this property.

Ms. Spong inquired to Commissioner Mazanec, as a resident of this neighborhood, if he has heard anything from the community regarding this property as a nuisance; or this HPC public hearing. Commissioner Mazanec responded that he has not heard of anything. Commissioner Trimble added that the Dayton's Bluff Land Use Committee had not been meeting and only recently reformed. Commissioner Mazanec suggested that this may be an opportunity for him to reach out the community as a commission member.

Mr. Erchul stated that he had contacted the community organizer and Carol Carey to inform them of the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Wagner noted concern with Commissioner Mazanec's suggestion to leave the building standing for 2-3 years due to the structural instability of the masonry walls. Commissioner Mazanec agreed with Commissioner Wagner's concern and noted the responsibility of the HRA to maintain the property and ensure the safety of the building.

The motion passed 6-2 (Mazanec, Trimble).

VII. Committee Reports None were stated.

VIII. Motion to Adjourn 9:33 PM

Submitted by R.Cohn & C. Boulware