

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CITY OF SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA
Lower Level – Room 41, City Hall/Court House, 15 West Kellogg Boulevard
August 22, 2013

Present: Richard Dana, Robert Ferguson, Matt Hill, Michael Justin, Richard Laffin, Diane Trout-Oertel, Renee Hutter Barnes, Matt Mazanec

Absent: David Riehle (not excused), Steve Trimble (excused), David Wagner (excused)

Staff Present: Christine Boulware, Amy Spong, Bill Dermody, Renee Cohn

PUBLIC HEARING/DESIGN REVIEW

- I. **Call to Order** 5:02p
- II. **Approval of the Agenda** Commissioner Dana motioned to approve the agenda; Commissioner Justin seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.
- III. **Conflicts of Interest** None were stated.
- IV. **Chair's Announcements** None were stated.
- V. **Staff Announcements**
 - A. Staff announced a save-the-date for an event at the Minnesota Landmark Center.
- VI. **Approval of the meeting minutes** Commissioner Dana motioned to approve the August 8, 2013 meeting minutes; Commissioner Hutter-Barnes seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.
 - A. August 8, 2013 Business Meeting
- VII. **Old Business**
 - A. Staff discussed updates made to a previous decision made by the Commission in regards to the public alley in Lowertown behind the public alley.
 - B. Staff updated the Commission on the progress of the Fourth Street projects.
- VIII. **Public Hearings**
 - A. **295 Summit Avenue #3, Hill Historic District**, by owner Mark Saliterman, for a demolition permit to raze the brick walled structure (coal house) at the back of the brick carriage house. **File #13-029** (Spong, 266-6714) **Continued from the August 8th Public Hearing**

Staff read aloud the report recommending conditional approval of the application for a demolition permit to raze the brick walled structure (coal house) at the back of the brick carriage house.

Ms. Spong provided additional historic information and current conditions of the coal house. She also noted that herself, Commissioner Dana, and Chair Laffin had conducted a site visit.

Staff presented current photos and historic documentation of the site. Staff clarified the portion of the structure in question.

Commissioner Dana discussed various points of concern in relation to the coal house. Commissioner Dana claimed that the coal house is integral to the carriage house structure and that there is no evidence of structural failure.

Chair Laffin inquired as to Commissioner Dana's opinion of the stated cost of the reconstruction of the coal house; Commissioner Dana discussed the role of the mason and contractor in the reconstruction and the basis for cost based on warranty.

Commissioner Dana discussed the reconstruction and rehabilitation possibilities. Chair Laffin noted the connection of the coal house to the carriage house.

Chair Laffin requested that Commissioner Dana estimate the cost of the entire wall versus patching and tuck-pointing the wall; Commissioner Dana stated that the costs would be comparable.

Chair Laffin noted that no interior photos were provided. Chair Laffin and staff clarified the portions of the coal house that are proposed for demolition. Commissioner Dana noted that one existing wall of the coal house is attached to the carriage house.

Commissioner Mazanec requested confirmation on the build date of the carriage house; staff clarified that the carriage house was built in 1915.

Commissioner Hill requested that Ms. Spong elaborate on the potential impacts of Maiden Lane; Ms. Spong noted that the impacts are related to another wall on the property, and not the coal house.

Mark Saliterman, the owner and applicant, was present to discuss the application.

Mr. Saliterman clarified the difference between the bids provided which were \$80,000 to re-build the structure as is, and \$30,000 to re-build the coal house halfway.

Mr. Saliterman discussed statements made by a city official in regards to the instability of the structure. He noted that he had not been previously aware of the option to rehabilitate the structure.

A discussion was had regarding the structural integrity and the possibilities for repair of the brick wall of the coal house.

Mr. Saliterman requested confirmation on the bid to re-build the wall halfway; Commissioner Dana clarified that this bid was in reference to re-building the wall with existing brick would lessen the height of the wall.

Chair Laffin stated that based on the conversation the cost of rehabilitating the structure would be less than the cost of complete demolition. Ms. Spong noted that complete demolition would also require repair of the area of attachment on the carriage house. Mr. Saliterman noted his preference of demolition.

Chair Laffin restated the recommendation of staff and noted that partial demolition of the wall would allow for better assessment of the wall.

Mr. Saliterman suggested that the decision be held over to allow for a site visit with a partial removal of the wall.

Ms. Spong read aloud a letter in support of the staff recommendation.

Chair Laffin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Dana moved to deny the application for a demolition permit to raze the brick walled structure (coal house) at the back of the brick carriage house; Commissioner Trot-Oertel seconded the motion.

Commissioner Ferguson requested clarification that another motion can be made post-denial of the current application; Ms. Spong confirmed.

The motion passed 7-0.

Commissioner Dana inquired as to the possibility of approving a motion to allow staff to make additional decisions post-demolition. Ms. Spong described the two-step process normally implemented for demolition permit. Ms. Spong suggested to the Commission that a motion be made to approve partial demolition with conditions to guide rehabilitation.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel inquired as to a conditional approval of partial demolition with repair be considered a staff approval; Ms. Spong discussed the possibility of a staff approval if the wall is partially demolished and re-built with existing or like materials.

Chair Laffin discussed the ideal goal to preserve the wall as is.

Commissioner Dana moved to reconsider the vote.

Commissioner Dana moved to approve a partial demolition permit for the purposes of the assessing the condition of the existing structure and determining options to move forward; Commissioner Trout-Oertel seconded the motion.

Commissioner Ferguson suggested that purpose of the partial demolition also be to stabilize the structure.

Commissioner Dana moved to withdraw the motion.

Commissioner Hutter-Barnes moved to reconsider the vote; Commissioner Trout-Oertel seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

Commissioner Dana moved to approve a partial demolition permit to allow removal of the unstable material and unstable portions of the wall for the purposes of establishing options for the final treatment; Commissioner Trout-Oertel seconded the motion.

The motion passed 7-0.

Chair Laffin reiterated the decision to Mr. Saliterman. Mr. Saliterman requested written confirmation of the Commission decision and steps for further action.

B. 613 Greenbrier Street, Dayton's Bluff Heritage Preservation District, by Window World Twin Cities, for a permit to install twelve vinyl windows in existing openings. File #13-033 (Spong, 266-6714)

Staff read aloud the report recommending denial of the application to install twelve vinyl windows in the existing openings.

Chair Laffin requested confirmation on the location of the windows proposed for replacement; it was confirmed that the windows are all on the second floor of the building.

Commissioner Mazanec inquired as to if a site visit had been conducted; staff confirmed that a site visit had not been conducted.

Ken Dickinson, the owner of the property, was present to discuss the application.

Mr. Dickinson stated that Window World has already purchased the windows. He also discussed a previous project in 2003 in which Window World installed windows without a permit; staff confirmed that there is no record of a previous permit.

A discussion was had regarding the current condition of the existing wood windows.

Chair Laffin inquired as Mr. Dickinson's opinion of the previously installed vinyl windows on the property; Mr. Dickinson stated his satisfaction of the windows. A discussion was had regarding the merits of vinyl and wood windows.

Ms. Spong requested confirmation of the model number of the proposed windows; it was confirmed that the model is the 4000 series with a weld and a half-screen. It was also confirmed that this is the same model from 2003.

Chair Laffin noted that the proposed windows may be too small for the existing frames; Ms. Boulware confirmed that there is no indication of custom sizes on the order form. Mr. Saliterman stated that Window World had told him these were custom windows.

Ms. Spong inquired as to if the existing frames need repair; Mr. Dickinson stated that they do not and the vinyl windows will be installed in them.

Ms. Spong inquired as to if Mr. Dickinson has photos of the previously installed windows; Mr. Dickinson stated that he does not. Chair Laffin noted the difficulty for the Commission to make a decision with the provided information.

Ms. Cohn noted that staff had been in contact with the applicant, and had been provided limited information.

Commissioner Dana inquired as to if the Department of Safety and Inspection had received a building permit application; staff confirmed that they had. A discussion was had regarding the egress standards regarding these windows.

Ms. Spong inquired as to if all windows ordered are double-hung windows; Mr. Dickinson confirmed that they are and noted the location of the windows.

Chair Laffin inquired as to a warranty from Window World; Mr. Dickinson stated that there is a lifetime warranty.

Chair Laffin stated concern for the longevity of vinyl windows, particularly if installed in historic properties.

Commissioner Dana inquired as to if Mr. Dickinson had paid Window World; Mr. Dickinson confirmed that he had not.

A discussion was had regarding different types and cost differences of wood and vinyl windows.

Ms. Spong inquired as to the possibility of additional photos; Mr. Dickinson confirmed that this is a possibility.

Ms. Spong requested confirmation of the plan to install the windows regarding the exterior ivy and noted the difficulty of obtaining exterior photos with the ivy present.

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

Commissioner Trout-Oertel moved to deny the application based on staff recommendation; Commissioner Mazanec seconded the motion.

Commissioner Hill inquired as to the possibility to layover for further information; Chair Laffin confirmed that the owner can return with a new application. Staff noted that the owner or applicant can appeal the decision.

Commissioner Dana expressed agreement to deny the current application and encourage the owner to return with another application. Commissioner Hutter-Barnes agreed with Commissioner Dana.

Commissioner Mazanec noted that more information is need on the condition of the windows.

The motion passed 7-0.

C. 360 Maria Avenue, Dayton's Bluff Heritage Preservation District, by BB Housing Associates, for a building permit to rehabilitate the residence, construct a new front porch and site improvements. **File #13-034** (Boulware, 266-6715)

Staff read aloud the report recommending conditional approval of the application for a building permit to rehabilitate the residence, construct a new front porch and site improvements.

Ms. Boulware presented photos of the property and drawings of the proposal.

A discussion was had regarding the proposed and possible design details of the proposal.

Commissioner Mazanec requested multiple clarifications of the design details described in the proposal and staff report; Ms. Boulware clarified these details and discussed their precedents.

Commissioner Ferguson commented on the historic significance of two-over-two double hung windows.

Michael Buelon was present to represent BB Housing.

Mr. Buelon noted two additions to the proposal: removal of the rear chimney and one-over-one windows on the front elevation. Ms. Boulware noted that staff could not approve one-over-one windows on the front elevation.

A discussion was had regarding the proposed window type and the removal of the chimney.

A discussion was had regarding the timeline of the project.

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

Commissioner Mazanec moved to approve the application based of staff recommendation, including the removal of the rear chimney; Commissioner Justin seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

Chair Laffin inquired as to the condition of the vinyl windows at 360 Maria Avenue; Mr. Buelon discussed the condition and expected lifetime of the window.

Ms. Boulware noted that 360 and 362 Maria Avenue have had several owners in a short period of time.

D. 362 Maria Avenue, Dayton's Bluff Heritage Preservation District, by BB Housing Associates, for a building permit to rehabilitate the residence, construct a new front porch and site improvements. **File #13-035** (Boulware, 266-6715)

Staff read aloud the report recommending conditional approval to approve the application for a building permit to rehabilitate the residence, construct a new front porch and site improvements. Staff noted that conditions regarding the windows shall be stricken.

Ms. Boulware presented photos of the property and drawings of the proposal.

Commissioner Mazanec requested clarification of the process to decide on an appropriate design of the front door; Ms. Boulware discussed the process and precedent.

Michael Buelon was present to represent BB Housing.

Mr. Buelon discussed his preference for the front door style.

Mr. Buelon noted the addition of the removal of two chimneys to the proposal.

Commissioner Mazanec inquired as to if the chimney removal is in the findings; Ms. Boulware confirmed that it is not and that the removal can be a staff approval.

Mr. Buelon requested that the porch railing be omitted from the proposal.

A discussion was had regarding details that will be reviewed once the existing siding on the property is removed.

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

Commissioner Mazanec moved to approve the application based of staff recommendation, including the removal of both chimneys and with the addition of a condition to require more exploration of the front entry design; Commissioner Hutter-Barnes seconded the motion.

Chair Laffin requested a design review committee be formed. Commissioners Mazanec, Hutter-Barnes, and Trimble were appointed to the design review committee.

The motion passed 7-0.

E. 1890 Summit Avenue, Summit Avenue West Heritage Preservation District, by Bill Marzolf, owner, for a building permit to construct a two story addition and patio at the rear of the house. **File #13-036** (Dermody, 266-6617)

Staff summarized the report recommending conditional approval of the application for a building permit to construct a two story addition and patio at the rear of the house.

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

Commissioner Hutter-Barnes inquired as to the reason the for the reveal on only one side; Mr. Dermody stated that the reveal is only proposed on the two-story side of the addition.

Commissioner Mazanec requested clarification of condition number six; staff clarified that this condition is to preserve the rear corner of the existing residence.

Commissioner Dana inquired as to if there had been contact with staff prior to presentation to the Commission; Ms. Spong stated that Ms. Boulware had been in contact with the applicant regarding the design of the proposal.

Meghan Kell Cornell (the architect), and Bill Marzolf (the owner and applicant) were present to discuss the proposal.

Chair Laffin inquired as to how the 6-inch setback would impact the interior of the second floor bedroom; Ms. Cornell stated that there would be a significant impact.

Commissioner Dana inquired as to if the entire property will be re-stuccoed; Ms. Cornell stated that it would. A discussion was had regarding product possibilities.

A discussion was had regarding the assumed framing system of the residence.

Chair Laffin requested that Ms. Cornell present the proposed furniture layout of the second floor bedroom.

Commissioner Hutter-Barnes inquired as to other design options for the rear corner of the residence in relation to the addition; Ms. Cornell discussed other design options.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel inquired as to if a true reveal was considered; Ms. Cornell noted that a three-inch reveal would be more optimal.

A discussion was had regarding design solutions for the interior of the second floor bedroom to mitigate the condition of the reveal.

Chair Laffin noted that a three-inch reveal might appear insignificant.

A discussion was had regarding the design details of the presented exterior board and window configuration.

Ms. Cornell inquired as to if an exterior trellis would be considered to differentiate the new addition. Ms. Spong noted that this may require zoning clearance; Ms. Cornell stated that they have clearance.

Chair Laffin noted the configuration of the second story windows regarding the bedroom furniture arrangement; Ms. Cornell acknowledged this issue. Chair Laffin noted that the new windows may appear too similar to the existing residence. The discussion was continued regarding the design details of the window configuration.

Commissioner Dana inquired as to the possibility of a brick column to denote the existing corner; Ms. Cornell noted that this is possible, but not preferred.

A discussion was had regarding design details of the corner in question and the preference of Ms. Cornell.

Chair Laffin inquired as to the opinion of the Commission regarding the condition for an offset corner. A discussion was had regarding the necessity of the reveal and the impact of the reveal to the interior of the second floor bedroom.

Ms. Cornell suggested that the Commission make note of the design details on the other side of the property to distinguish old from new. She also addressed the position of a gutter and inquired as to if this would require review; Ms. Spong noted that it would not.

Ms. Spong stated that the review of this project is consistent with other application for additions and the precedent for preservation of the existing corner.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel inquired as to the precedent for the reveal; Ms. Spong noted that there is some precedent, but design is dependent on material.

Ms. Cornell brought attention to the existing brick base of the residence and the possibility of preserving the condition to demonstrate the transition to the addition.

A discussion was had regarding the arrangement options for the furniture in the second story bedroom.

Ms. Cornell presented a new option for an exterior pilaster to demonstrate the transition to the new addition. Commissioner Ferguson acknowledged this option and discussed other design possibilities to create the perception of the existing corner.

A discussion was had regarding the arrangement options for the furniture in the second story bedroom and the possible exterior design options previously noted.

Mr. Marzolf stated his preference for the arrangement of the second story bedroom and expressed appreciation of the discussion to address the impact caused by the reveal.

Ms. Cornell noted that the gutter had not yet been included in the drawing, but would be in the corner in question.

Mr. Dermody re-stated the written testimony regarding drainage on the property.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Dana moved to conditionally approve the application based on staff recommendation with a revision to condition No. 5 that the reveal be no less than two inches and no more than six inches; Commissioner Ferguson seconded the motion.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel requested clarification that the motion in to require a two inch reveal; Commissioner Dana confirmed. Commissioner Dana noted that this motion is based on the stated impacts of the interior.

Commissioner Hill disagreed with the motion and stated that the addition of an exterior trellis would be sufficient.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel stated that she will not be voting for the motion based on the stated impacts of the interior second floor bedroom. Ms. Cornell addressed this condition.

Commissioner Hutter-Barnes stated disapproval of both options and suggested that this design detail be laid over and that further options be explored regarding previously stated concerns.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that a decision must be made on condition No. 5 and noted that a setback is necessary for that corner based on the discussion.

The motion passed 5-1 (Hill) with one abstention (Hutter-Barnes).

Ms. Cornell requested clarification of the need to resubmit for the extension of the trellis; Ms. Spong confirmed that it would need to be resubmitted to the Commission and noted possible concerns.

IX. Motion to Adjourn 8:27p

Submitted by R.Cohn