

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

FILE NAME: 260 Summit Avenue

APPLICANT: Jon Dietrich – Hardline Concrete & Masonry

OWNER: Richard Nicholson

ARCHITECT: N/A

DATE OF APPLICATION: July 6, 2016

DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING: July 28, 2016

HPC SITE/DISTRICT: Historic Hill Heritage Preservation Districts

CATEGORY: Pivotal

WARD: 1

DISTRICT COUNCIL: 8

INVENTORY NUMBERS: Historic Hill Heritage Preservation District - RA-SPC-4581
Louis W. and Maud Hill House - RA-SPC-3583

CLASSIFICATION: After-the-Fact Building Permit

BUILDING PERMIT #: 16-052410

STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Christine Boulware

DATE OF REPORT: July 25, 2016 update July 28, 2016

A. SITE DESCRIPTION: The Louis W. And Maud Hill House, at 260 Summit Avenue, is a large, three and one-half story, Georgian Revival style residence constructed in two phases. Clarence H. Johnston, Sr. designed the original house, now the rear portion of the building, which was constructed in 1902. It has a slate-tiled gambrel roof with dormers, elaborate classical cornice, dark red pressed brick walls, cut stone foundations, and a two-story rectangular rear projecting bay with polygonal one-story solarium and arcaded loggia below. Architect Charles Frost of Chicago designed the large, two-story, front addition which was constructed in 1913. There is a two-stall, brick garage located to the northeast of the house and an integral, red-brick wall that spans the distance of the Walnut Street stairway. The wall is laid in a Common Bond, and is three wythe with a terra cotta coping. The lot slopes steeply down to Irvine Avenue and the property is categorized as pivotal to the Historic Hill Heritage Preservation District.

B. WORK COMPLETED: The sandstone steps and landing at the front entry were demolished by the applicant.

C. PROPOSED CHANGES: The applicant proposes to construct a concrete landing and steps in a gray color with a blue stone texture at the front entry using the existing foundation and reusing the existing handrails. The applicant also proposes to demolish the sandstone stairs that connect the driveway and side yard to the house and front yard, replace the sandstone with gray tinted concrete, and repoint the wall. Staff has verified with the applicant that the wall proposed to be repointed is the abutting brick wall, not the limestone retaining wall.

D. BACKGROUND:

- June 28, 2016 – Todd Sutter, building inspector, observed the front entry steps being demolished at the site and informed the contractor to stop work and apply for a building permit and HPC review and approval. Staff spoke with the applicant in our office and informed them that the project would require review by the Heritage Preservation Commission at a public hearing.

- July 6 – An application and before-and-after photos were submitted for review and the applicant proposed additional changes including the replacement of the stairs from the driveway/side yard to the house and repointing a wall.
- July 25 – HPC staff visited the site and photographed the current condition of the entry and side stairway. Staff then contacted the contractor regarding additional information needed.
- July 26 – The applicant verified: “there will be NO tuck-pointing of any limestone walls. There will be various grinding and tuck-pointing of brick walls. Mortar to be used type N, grey by spec-mix.”

E. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:

Historic Hill Heritage Preservation District - Guidelines for Design Review

Sec. 74.64. - Restoration and rehabilitation.

(a) *General Principles:*

(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.*

(7) *The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building materials shall not be undertaken.*

(8) *Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archaeological resources affected by or adjacent to any project.*

(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.

(b) Masonry and Foundations:

(1) Whenever possible, original masonry and mortar should be retained without the application of any surface treatment. Masonry should be cleaned only when necessary to halt deterioration and always with the gentlest method possible, such as low-pressure water and soft natural bristle brushes. Brick and stone surfaces should not be sandblasted because it erodes the surface of the material and accelerates deterioration. Chemical cleaning products which could have an adverse chemical reaction with the masonry material should not be used.

(2) Original mortar joint size and profile should be retained and replacement mortar should match the original mortar in color and texture. Materials and ingredient proportions similar to the original mortar should be used when repointing, with replacement mortar softer than the masonry units and no harder than the historic mortar. This will create a bond similar to the original and is necessary to prevent damage to the masonry units. Repointing with mortar of high portland cement content often creates a bond stronger than is appropriate for the original building materials, possibly resulting in cracking or other damage. Mortar joints should be carefully washed after setup to retain the neatness of the joint lines and keep extraneous mortar off of masonry surfaces.

(3) The original color and texture of masonry surfaces should be retained. While unpainted masonry surfaces should not be painted, paint should not be indiscriminately removed from masonry surfaces because some brick surfaces were originally meant to be painted.

(f) Porches and Exterior Architectural Features:

(1) Porches and steps which are 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 integrity and, whenever possible, should be retained. Porches and steps removed from the building should be reconstructed, using photographic documentation and historical research, to be 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.

(2) Decorative architectural features such as cornices, brackets, railings, and those around front doors and windows should be preserved. New material used to repair or replace, where necessary, deteriorated architectural features of wood, iron, cast iron, terracotta, tile and brick should match the original as closely as possible.

(Ord. No. 17815, § 3(II) 4-2-91)

F. FINDINGS:

1. On April 2, 1991, the most recent expansion of the Historic Hill Heritage Preservation District was established under Ordinance No. 17815, § 3(II), reflecting the current boundaries. 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 sandstone front entry landing and steps were removed on Jun 28, 2016 without HPC review and approval or a building permit. The front entry and prominent two-story portico is a character defining feature of the property.

3. The side yard stairway has sandstone steps and is abutted by a limestone retaining wall and a brick wall that matched the brick and pattern of the house. The steps are settling toward the limestone wall. The stairway is setback from the street, visible from the Walnut Street stairway and James J. Hill House and appears to date to the construction of the 1913 portion of the house.
4. Sec. 74.64. (a)(2) The removal of the front entry steps and landing does not comply with the principle that 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.*" The removal and replacement of the sandstone steps at the side yard stairway would result in the loss of historic material, but replacement with concrete steps may be justified given the less prominent location stairway and if the historic sandstone is used to reconstruct the front entry steps and landing.
5. Sec. 74.64. (a)(6) The removal of the front entry steps and landing does not comply with the principle that states, "*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.*" The proposed concrete steps and landing would be concrete, gray in color, and have a bluestone texture; the proposal does not comply with the principle. The removal and replacement of the side yard sand stone steps with concrete would not comply with the guideline, but in the sandstone were used to reconstruct the front entry steps and landing and the replacement steps at the side yard stairway replicated the sandstone in size, color, profile, and texture, the replacement may be justified.
6. Sec. 74.64. (f)(1) The guideline states, "*Porches and steps which are appropriate to the building and its development should be retained.*" The steps and landing at the front should be reconstructed to match the original in material, size, color, profile, texture, and detail given the prominence of the entry and that the entry is a character defining feature of the property. Because the existing, black metal hand rails are proposed to be reused, the guideline states, "it is important to maintain the original spacing, section and profile of the balustrades." Railings should be reinstalled in a location and way that do not alter or damage historic materials or details.
7. Sec. 74.64. (b)(1) A masonry scope-of-work and mortar specifications were not provided for the proposed repointing work. The guideline states, "*Whenever possible, original masonry and mortar should be retained without the application of any surface treatment.*"
8. Sec. 74.64. (b)(2) The guideline states, "*Original mortar joint size and profile should be retained and replacement mortar should match the original mortar in color and texture. Materials and ingredient proportions similar to the original mortar should be used when repointing, with replacement mortar softer than the masonry units and no harder than the historic mortar. This will create a bond similar to the original and is necessary to prevent damage to the masonry units. Repointing with mortar of high portland cement content often creates a bond stronger than is appropriate for the original building materials, possibly resulting in cracking or other damage. Mortar joints should be carefully washed after setup to retain the neatness of the joint lines and keep extraneous mortar off of masonry surfaces.*" Detailed information will need to be provided in the masonry specifications and scope-of-work.
9. Violation: St. Paul Legislative Code section 73.07 states that persons who violate Legislative Code Chapter 73, or assist in the commission of violation of Chapter 73, are guilty of a misdemeanor. Section 73.07 further states that a historic preservation site on which there exists any remodeling, repairing or construction in violation of chapter 73 constitutes a nuisance.
10. Violation: The property, at 260 Summit Avenue, is located in the Historic Hill Heritage Preservation District and is subject to St. Paul Legislative Code Chapter 73 and the Historic Hill Heritage Preservation District Design Review Guidelines. As such, a permit must be obtained prior to any exterior work, construction, or demolition. The front sandstone entry steps and

landing at 260 Summit Avenue were removed without a permit or HPC review and approval. The removal of the sandstone steps and landing do not comply with Historic Hill Heritage Preservation District Design Guidelines and were performed in violation of St. Paul Legislative Code Chapter 73.

11. The removal and replacement of the front entry sandstone steps and landing with concrete steps and landing with a bluestone texture will have an adverse impact on the property and the Program for Preservation and architectural control of the Historic Hill Heritage Preservation Districts [Leg. Code §73.06 (e)].
12. The proposal to remove and replace all pedestrian ramps at the intersections and the median sidewalks to meet the requirements of current ADA laws and reuse granite curbing or replace it in-kind will not have an adverse impact on the property or the Program for Preservation and architectural control of the Historic Hill and West Summit Avenue Heritage Preservation Districts [Leg. Code §73.06 (e)] so long as the conditions are met.

F. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the findings, staff recommends denial of the proposal to replace the front entry sandstone steps and landing with concrete with a bluestone texture. The HPC and/or HPC staff could review and approve a proposal to construct a new sandstone landing and steps at the front entry in the same footprint, color, texture, and configuration as the historic steps and landing with the handrails re-installed.

Further, based on the findings staff recommends approval of the proposal to replace the sandstone steps at the side yard stairs with concrete and repoint the abutting brick wall provided the following condition(s) are met:

1. The new side yard steps shall match the historic steps in size, color, texture, and profile.
2. The sandstone steps shall be carefully removed so they are not damaged. The sandstone steps shall be stored and reused at the front entry if feasible.
3. There shall be no removal, alterations, or damage to historic fences, walls or columns. If damage or alteration occurs, the features shall be repaired to the historic condition with consultation, review, and approval by HPC staff.
4. The masonry scope-of-work and mortar specifications for repointing the brick wall abutting the side yard stairs shall be submitted to HPC staff for review and approval. A small (3'x3') test area, inconspicuously located, shall be prepared and repointed for review by HPC staff. Staff shall be called to conduct a site visit and consult on how to proceed prior to the ordering of materials or commencement of additional work.
5. New mortar shall be no stronger than Type N and match the historic mortar and mortar joints in color, texture, aggregate, size, and joint profile.
6. All final materials, colors, and details shall be submitted to the HPC and/or staff for final review and approval.
7. Any revisions to the approved plans shall be reviewed and approved by the HPC and/or staff.
8. The HPC stamped approved plans shall remain on site for the duration of the project.
9. A double-fee shall be applied to the building permit given the work was performed in violation of St. Paul Legislative Code Chapter 73.

G. ATTACHMENTS

1. HPC Design Review Application
2. Before-and-After Photographs
3. Photos by Staff 7-25-16
4. Email correspondence



CITY OF ST PAUL
 Department of Safety and Inspections
 375 Jackson Street, Suite 220
 St Paul, Minnesota 55101-1806

COPY

GENERAL BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION

Visit our Web Site at www.stpaul.gov/dsi

PROJECT ADDRESS	Number	Street Name	St. Ave. Blvd. Etc.	N S E W	Suite/Apt	Building Name	Date
	260	Summit	Av			Dave	6-28-2018

Contractor	(Include Contact Person)	Address	City	State, Zip + 4	Phone
Hard Line Concrete Masonry		7421 Bester Ave	Inner Grove Hts.	MN 55076	651-387-2867
State Building Contr. Lic. #	BC 709 408				

Contractor's Email: jon@hardline-mn.com 3/31/2018
 Architect/Designer: _____ Email: _____ Phone: _____

Property Owner	(Include Contact Person)	Address	City	State, Zip + 4	Phone
Dick Nicholson					(651) 292-8709

Select the Type of Work ▶ New Structure Addition Remodel/Alter Repair

Select Applicable Installation Below.	Select Type of Use ▶	# of Existing Dwelling Units ▶	
<input type="checkbox"/> Windows: # of windows ▶	Mixed Commercial/ Residential buildings enter information for both the Residential and Commercial Use.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Residential: Final # of Dwelling Units ▶	
<input type="checkbox"/> Roofing: # of squares ▶		# of Dwelling Units Worked On ▶	
<input type="checkbox"/> Siding: # of squares ▶		<input type="checkbox"/> Commercial: Value of Coml. Work ▶	\$
▶ Note: 1 Square = 100 Square Feet		Est. Start Date ▶	Est. Finish Date ▶
		6-28-2018	6-31-2018
		Total Value ▶	\$ 17,000.00

Description of Project:
 Remove & Replace front steps with concrete

Applicant certifies that all information is correct and that all pertinent state regulations and city ordinances will be complied with in performing the work for which this permit is issued.

[Signature]
 Applicant's Signature

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY FOR NEW STRUCTURE OR ADDITION

Structure Dimensions (In Feet)						Is a Fire Suppression System Available? (i.e. - Sprinklers)
Width	Length	Height	Total Square-Foot (include basement)	Basement	# of Stories	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5'	20'	18"	12054	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Lot Dimensions (In Feet)		Set Backs from Property Lines			
Lot Width	Lot Depth	Front	Back	Side 1	Side 2

For Office Use Only

Change/Expansion of Use? Yes / No	Occupancy Group	SUMMARY OF FEES	
Existing Primary Use SFD	12C-1	Building Permit Fee	\$
Proposed Primary Use SFD	VB	State Surcharge	\$
Zoning District R2/R2-2	Plan Number	Plan Check	\$

PLAN REVIEW REMARKS				SAC	\$
				SAC Processing Fee	\$
				Design Review Fee	\$
				Park Dedication Fee	\$
S.A.C. #:	Reviewed By:	Date:	Warning Folder #	Total Permit Fee	\$
Charge	Credit		03-314150		
State Valuation: \$				Vacant Bldg. Folder #	(For Office Use Only) PERMIT # ▶ HPC 16-052410

Signature of Cardholder (required for all charges): _____

<input type="checkbox"/> AMEX	<input type="checkbox"/> Discover	<input type="checkbox"/> MasterCard	<input type="checkbox"/> Visa	Security Code ▶	Expiration Month/Year ▶
Enter Account Number ▶▶					

FOR HPC OFFICE USE ONLY

Date received: _____

FILE NO. _____

Date complete: _____

District: _____ /Individual Site: _____

Pivotal/Contributing/Non-contributing/New Construction/Parcel

Requires staff review

Supporting data: **YES NO**
Complete application: **YES NO**

The following condition(s) must be met in order for application to conform to preservation program:

It has been determined that the work to be performed pursuant to the application does not adversely affect the program for preservation and architectural control of the heritage preservation district or site (Ch.73.06).

HPC staff approval

Date _____

Requires Commission review

Submitted:

- 3 Sets of Plans
- 15 Sets of Plans reduced to 8 ½" by 11" or 11" by 17"
- Photographs
- CD of Plans (pdf) & Photos (jpg)
- City Permit Application
- Complete HPC Design Review application

Hearing Date set for: _____

City Permit # ____ - _____

HPC Staff Notes

Empty box for HPC Staff Notes.