

**Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission Meeting
September 24, 2012, Room 317 City Hall**

Date of Z&P Meeting: December 10, 2012

ITEM SUMMARY

- Description** Item #2, BZH #27451
1500 6th Street South, Gluek Brewing Tied House
Currie Park Development, LLC has submitted a Demolition of Historic Resource application to allow for the demolition of the Gluek Brewing Tied House at 1500 6th Street South.
- Action** The Heritage Preservation Commission **continued** the Demolition of Historic Resource application of the Gluek Brewing Saloon at 1500 6th Street South for two cycles to the November 5, 2012, Heritage Preservation Commission meeting to allow the applicant time to complete a comprehensive study of Gluek Brewing and Tied Houses in Minneapolis.
- Roll Call Vote** **Aye:** Faucher, Hunter Weir, Lackovic, Larsen, Lindberg, R. Mack, Tableporter
Absent: Haecker, L. Mack
Continued to November 5, 2012

TRANSCRIPTION

Staff Hanauer: So, with that, staff recommends that the HPC adopt the findings and continue the Demolition of the Gluek Brewing Saloon at 1500 6th Street South for two cycles to November 5 to allow the applicant time to complete a comprehensive study of Gluek Brewing Tied Houses in Minneapolis. I'd be happy to answer questions you may have.

Chair Larsen: Alright, questions of staff? Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Hunter Weir: Aaron, has anybody, the first thing that struck me about this one is, I believe this area was within the city's liquor patrol limits, so it is beyond neighborhood identity. I mean, that's part of it, but there were only three neighborhoods that had kind of, I'm trying to think what you want to call it, density of saloons and breweries, so that might be something to look at. And even though it is a little off Cedar Avenue, an inventory of how many of those snooze boulevard, if you will, saloons still exist in that neighborhood.

Hanauer: Thank you, Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Chair Larsen: Other questions at this time? Ok, I don't see any, thank you. So I will open up the public hearing. Is there anybody that wishes to speak for or against the application, please step forward.

Bianca Fine: Chairman Larsen, Honorable Commissioners, it is a pleasure to have an opportunity to present to you some details of our development and how it, hopefully, will fulfill the needs of the neighborhood and help the efforts of the city and the state and the county to really recognize the Cedar Riverside West Bank Neighborhood.

Chair Larsen: I'm sorry to interrupt, but could you state your name and address for the record for me?

Bianca Fine: I am Bianca Fine with Fine Associates and I would like also to introduce the members of our team which are here with me today. Bob Kueppers from Fine Associates, who deals with bricks and mortar; Elizabeth Gales from Charlene Roise's group; and Jessica Berglin, also from Charlene Roise's group. I should tell you that I am here (in place of) Charlene who had a major bicycle accident and she has five broken ribs and a broken pelvis so she has told me, you go there and you tell the story. So you'll have to forgive me if I am not as competent as Charlene would be. We have started working on this project about six years ago. And as you know from the previous information, this project, the site for this project, which is this red area, is an outstanding transit oriented location. Within half a mile of the site there are 21 stops for bus lines, many of them express buses and the site, together with the sites for two future phases, will really bridge the two LRT lines that will soon exist within the Twin Cities. The station of the Cedar Riverside station of the Hiawatha LRT line is next to what will be Phase 3 of the site and the station of the Central Corridor is a very short walk away. The site is next to some of the bike lanes of the city and we will in fact favor in our development design the use of bicycles and the use of means of mass transit and in addition to that it is an area which is phenomenally rich in jobs, in centers of improvement. There are about, well as you know there is the University of Minnesota, which has a budget of 3 billion a year which is next to the site. There is Augsburg College, there is the medical campus of Fairview Riverside and the (?) building. So there are about 100,000 jobs within one mile and about 300,000 jobs within three miles. It is (?) concentration of jobs, the neighborhood is very economically challenged. It is one of the poorest neighborhoods in the Twin Cities. It has 42% of the households which are at or below the level of poverty and the mean household income is 1/3 of what it is across the Twin Cities metropolitan area. One, we will be really listening to the needs of the neighborhood and there is one thing that the neighborhood needs terribly and that is affordable workforce housing. The neighborhood has a lot of very low income or subsidized housing, Section 8 housing, subsidized housing, but there is very little quality, affordable housing at the 50% - 60% mean metropolitan income, which is what is needed for people to work. So the people who work there live somewhere else, spend their money somewhere else, and this contributes to the cycle of poverty of the neighborhood. Also the neighborhood needs green spaces, because there is almost no green in this area. There is Currie Park, which is across the street from our development. There is another small park, but there is terribly little green spaces for families and children to exercise and to enjoy. Our development will respond to both these needs.

The second sheet of the packages which I hope you finally got gives you a sense of the location of the site we are planning to develop as it relates to the neighborhood. As you can see it is sandwiched between Riverside Plaza and Currie Park and is now occupied essentially by parking lots. Plus the building we are discussing. In the other corner there is the Mixed Blood Theater and we are planning to do some land swap with Mixed Blood to optimize the amount of land they have and allow an expansion, a long sought expansion that was in fact designed by Ralph Rapson. You should know that one of the reasons why the LRT line has not improved the economic life of the neighborhood is that it is isolated and unsafe. We want our development to create a pedestrian friendly, safe streetscape. That we connect our development but also the (?) and the LRT station with Cedar Avenue and the neighborhood. This is what the development is going to look like, and we have to thank the Committee of the Whole for giving us further suggestion and getting us to improve the design. As you can see even though it is a very large development, we have structured the articulated smaller bodice so that the final look will be of several smaller buildings and the pedestrian scape will be much more respected and there will be green spaces interspersed with this bodice. I don't want to use too much of your time but I just want to show you, you see there in your packets that towards 6th Street we are planning a green plaza open to 6th Street which would be landscaped with native plants so as to offer both recreational space and some water retention handling. And also all around the development there will be strips of land which will be landscaped with native plants. On the other side of the building there will be an elevated plaza that will be landscaped as an area for family gatherings, picnics, and with two large children's playing areas. The development includes family, a number of family units which are also terribly needed in this area. Large two bedrooms with two bathrooms, and three bedrooms with two or three bathrooms. This is the massing of the development and the little thing you see in the corner is the building we are discussing. You can see how if we try to keep it conservatively, that is reducing the amount, the volume of the new building as little as possible, it would look totally dwarfed by the building and really out of context. So the only way to give it some sort of context would be to cut out at least this portion of the building which would mean to cut out some 25-30 units and a number of parking spaces. And also, to somewhat deface the articulation of the building because all the efforts that we have put into creating something which would be harmonious and we will create a transition between those fortress like

tall buildings at Riverside Plaza and the pedestrian nature of the neighborhood will be frustrated because then your building will be sort of truncated around the stretch.

The neighborhood supports this development very strongly and even though they neighborhood strongly supports our attempts at moving the building, and we are discussing with several council members and with CPED staff how that could be done, and which parts of money could contribute to moving the building, perhaps to the Dania site. The neighborhood as represented by the West Bank Community Coalition has clearly expressed its opinion that they want our development and if this requires to tear down the building, regretful as it is, they support that. We would like to move the building, to move the building costs about \$450,000. The financial package for our new development is extremely stressed because we are trying to provide really high quality, affordable housing where almost every bedroom would have one bathroom, which is almost unheard of in affordable housing projects. And still we keep the cost per unit at about \$106,000 which is about 15% less than the usual number given for affordable housing. We could not afford to spend almost half a million dollars to move the building. If the city and other sources would contribute we'll certainly (?) something, not because we think that this building has a crucial historic role but because we think it's a nice old building. If it were possible to move it to the Dania site, we'd, for \$150,000 you'd get a good quality 300,000 sq ft plus of a good quality building, which is essentially a steal in today's construction cost. The building, if moved there, would be used by community organizations. We are, this thing was triggered by a group called (Cartuge?) which is a group that supports the (?) neighborhood use to keep them focused on learning and staying out of the street and being ready to contribute to the new country and staying away, especially the Somali and the Somali youth from the temptation of joining extremist groups. I'll be very happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chair Larsen: Questions at the moment? Ok, I don't think so. Certainly one of the questions we would have as your reaction to the staff recommendation for continuance. Your reaction to the staff recommendation for continuance to review the information, it looks as though you have provided some information as well?

Bianca Fine: Yes, and perhaps at the end of the session we would be better able to explain why we would prefer that the decision be taken now. Because, and I can give you that in a nutshell: first of all, we've already done quite a bit of work so you will see that one of the reasons for the continuation was to get more information about the Tied Houses of the Gluek Brewery, and you will see that we have quite a bit of it. And two, that the continuation would delay the start of the project and it is important to start it early in the spring to, again, keep the costs down. Because if you delay and you start getting into the summer or early fall then you deal with the winter and the construction costs go up. And with being really following the principal of waste not want not so that every penny could be put to good use. But we will tell you more about it.

Chair Larsen: Alright, thank you.\

Bianca Fine: Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Please state your name and address for the record.

Jessica Berglin: I'm Jessica Berglin from Hess Roise and Company at 100 North First Street. I'm happy to present on the historical aspects of 1500 South 6th Street. Let me see if I can zoom ... there we go. So as you can see we have the property in question at the bottom here and then a historical photo ...

Chair Larsen: Did you, just as a quick point of clarification, sorry to interrupt, you brought this information today, is that correct?

Jessica Berglin: Correct.

Chair Larsen: So staff hasn't had an opportunity to review this information, is that correct?

Jessica Berglin: Correct. So in some, we've conducted additional research at the Minneapolis Central Public Library with the Minneapolis collection, the Minnesota Historical Society, building records, newspaper and

clippings files, and our in-house library and research files. And like Commissioner Hunter Weir said, there was historically, a liquor patrol district which we have an 1893 map outlined here. And in it, we've conducted additional research to identify extant examples of Gluek Brewing Company Tied Houses. You can see that the blue dot in the corner here represents 1500 South 6th Street and then there are 13 additional located throughout the liquor patrol district. And Gluek Brewing Company actually had a short window of opportunity for constructing its tied houses. It constructed its first one, it opening in 1902 which is now Gluek's Bar and Restaurant at 16 South 6th Street, and then it would only have had until 1919 when Prohibition went into effect to construct its additional tied houses. So it had 17 years to contract with tied houses. After Prohibition, tied houses were prohibited due to changes in the law related to alcohol distribution. And so to take a look at examples of these other tied houses, first we have the main one like we mentioned at 16 6th Street, the main Gluek headquarters and tied house which is an exemplary example of Boehme and Cordella's architecture. This was constructed in 1902 and was designated a local landmark by the HPC in 1984. Other examples include 501 Cedar Avenue which is now Nomad World Pub; 1913 Cedar Avenue, which is now the Joint Bar; 119 Washington Avenue North, which is now Haute Dish; 505 East Hennepin, which recently closed but it was the Union Bar; 219 3rd Avenue North, which is Monte Carlo restaurant; 923 Washington Avenue North, which is now Clubhouse Yaeger. And I'd like to point out that 501 and 913 Cedar Avenue are within blocks of the 1500 6th Street South example. And after reviewing staff's recommendation to survey additional tied houses, we identified six more extant examples. These include 2024 Washington Avenue North, which is Halek's Bar; 507 Washington Avenue North is Cuzzie's Bar and Restaurant; 315 Washington Avenue North is De ja Vue; 1428 Washington Avenue South is now part of Town Hall Brewery; and 18922 Riverside Avenue which was formerly Triangle Bar and now is the Riverside Holistic Health Clinic. And additionally we have 617 Central Avenue, which is Otter's Saloon. The main point of this ...

Chair Larsen: That information, we don't have in here, right, those last ones, correct?

Jessica Berglin: Correct. They are all listed on the map here, the locations at least, I'm sorry.

Chair Larsen: The locations are identified, but not indicated.

Jessica Berglin: Correct.

Chair Larsen: Ok.

Jessica Berglin: So our main argument here is that we identified 13 extant examples, and as we go through we have interior photos of the seven, only the seven that we identified in our initial report, which we'll get to in a bit. But as you will see, going through these, the integrity of 1500 South 6th Street has been completely compromised. It is surrounded by Riverside Plaza and its adjacent parking lots. It does have an historic building across the street and down the road, but those are completely segregated from one another, so it has lost its context. Additionally the building was unsympathetic remodeled on the interior. All historic features and characteristic features identifying it as a saloon have been removed, which I think you have photos in the original staff report. A lot of the characteristics that were in these bars, especially by Boehme and Cordella, were the pressed metal ceilings, broad windows, decorative window transoms, and a lot of the Gluek Tied Houses actually had a six-pointed star with the "G" in it to signify that it was associated with Gluek. Gluek Brewing Company. So all of these features have been removed from 1500 South 6th Street. Additionally, the second floor apartment left no trace of the historic layout when it was remodeled into a residence by Dr. Robert Johnson in the 1990s. Furthermore, a concrete block chamber was built in the basement and a lot of the structural columns in the basement were replaced. In terms of setting, feeling and association, like I mentioned, which have been severely compromised, the area once was a hub of a lot of neighborhood saloons but several of them are gone for recent developments.

And so now, as you will see, as we walk through some of these photos, you can see how the integrity of these remain and they are much better examples of this signature architecture of Boehme and Cordella, especially for Gluek Tied Houses. Here we have the Monte Carlo restaurant. Haute Dish on Washington Avenue. Nomad World Pub, and this one again is of interest because it is within block of 1500 South 6th Street. So there is that presence that remains through this and then another bar which we'll get to in a second. This is Club Jaeger, and I'd also like to point out the decorative transoms that remain. It is the only one, this is the only remaining example that we've found

so far, of these transoms with the G and the six-pointed star in them. And here is the Joint bar, and again if you can see the six pointed star that is in the middle of the building signifying it as a Gluek Tied House. This one, additionally, is just a few blocks away from 1500 South 6th Street. And here we have the property in question. You will notice the marked difference in the interior of the first floor. It is devoid of all historic features that were characteristic of a saloon, even the examples that maybe are less, have been cut up a little bit more than others, they still have very characteristic features such as a bar that ran the length of the interior wall, pressed metal ceiling, pressed metal wall panels, and as you can see new interior walls have been constructed and duct work that is unsympathetic to the interior. Additionally there was a dwelling to the rear of the building where this concrete block garage now stands. Here are some additional photos of the interior of the second floor apartment area. As you can see there is no trace of any historic layout, materials, finishings, anything like that. And in the basement there have been a couple of additions and replacement of structural columns. So based on this preliminary survey, it is clear that 1500 South 6th Street is not a quality remaining example of a Gluek Tied House nor is it the only remaining tied house in the Cedar Riverside neighborhood like the staff report suggest. A comprehensive survey of all Gluek tied houses would likely make 1500 South 6th Street less significant and less likely to be designated a local landmark. We would ask that the commission make a decision tonight so that the project may move forward, and I'm here to answer any questions you might have.

Chair Larsen: Questions?

Lindberg: I just have a procedural question, I guess, for yourself and Hilary ... are we allowed, because this information wasn't presented to staff, to make a decision upon it, if it's not submitted to staff? Like if it was received today, are we allowed to take it into consideration, or no?

Chair Larsen: We take in public testimony, so in that sense it is the same thing in terms of receiving photographs, etc. So we will take public testimony, people will receive letters from the public, comments on applications, so those likewise are letters. The question that we will have before us once we close the public hearing is whether or not you want to hear from staff based on the substantive information that is being provided and whether you want to hear that review and their input. So, but yes you can make a decision based on the information you have received. Any other questions?

Lackovic: Could you put your map up again, the one that shows this relative to the others? In your research, and what we don't have here are the dates that all of these were constructed. In your research, were you able to recognize a pattern ... did they start on one end and then as time went on were they built, or were they just built more helter skelter?

Jessica Berglin: Well we know that 1500 South 6th Street was built in 1903 and a couple of the North Washington ones were built in the teens, but other than that there hasn't been a comprehensive list with dates yet, so that would require additional research.

Chair Larsen: This would be on the early side, since it started in 1902.

Jessica Berglin: Correct, but again there was a very short window of time

Chair Larsen: Sounds like one a year, kind of almost. Ok, alright, any other questions? Ok, thank you. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak, please step forward.

Bianca Fine: Chairperson Larsen and Honorable Commissioners, I hope that you've seen the reasons why we would like a recommendation for demolition of this building. Having said that, I should assure you that we will continue to work with the city and the neighborhood and the (group) in an effort to move the building. And we would not tear down the building until the day before it is absolutely needed, and if there is a way to move it we will help moving it. I also think that the story of the beer making and of the tied house in Minnesota is very interesting and I would be happy as part of this development to continue the study and to give more body to it and more depth to it so as to provide people interested in the history of Minnesota with a history of how the tied houses developed, how they were born, how they developed, how they stopped, how they were used ... so there would be a reference

book. Finally, I've always considered even if you are to tell me yes you can go ahead and demolish the building, we have always considered reusing part of the building in the new building, like there is a bunch of pressed metal that we would like to use in the lobby of the new building as an example of what it was. So we would be very happy to do that. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Alright, this is a public hearing, is there anybody else that wishes to speak for or against the application, please step forward and state your name and address for the record.

Jeff Cline: My name is Jeff Cline, I live at 3136 10th Avenue South and I just want to express my opposition I guess. After listening to the arguments made by the different people I just feel like I guess I oppose the idea that because there is some left that it is ok to demolish this one. It seems like the strength of them comes in the, like, the more there are the more I sort of feel a sense of history and the more of that there is to sort of create this feel of Minneapolis. I guess I just didn't buy the logic of because it is not the last one that who cares. The more again of them, the stronger I feel it makes the case to keep it.

Chair Larsen: Ok, thank you very much, thanks for your input. Alright, is there anybody else that wishes to speak for or against the application, please step forward at this time. Seeing none, we'll close the public hearing. Commissioners, what's your pleasure? Commissioner Tableporter.

Tableporter: I had a question for Aaron about the process here. It seems like we've received public comment about the quantity of tied houses and the relative quality of this one, if you were to conduct a review, what would we be adding to the information you've seen tonight that would allow us to make a better decision? And my second question, I'll give them both to you at the same time, I'm very sympathetic to the project and the timeline, is this a project that we would be seeing due to its neighborhood and location as a project unto itself?

Hanauer: Commissioner Tableporter, could you repeat that second question?

Tableporter: Yes, would we be seeing this project, would this project be coming in front of us

Chair Larsen: If this was a parking lot, would we be reviewing I this project?

Hanauer: I can answer that one quickly, no.

Tableporter: Ok, so we are really deciding on, or is it our job to decide on the project as well?

Chair Larsen: No.

Tableporter: Just to decide on the building?

Chair Larsen: Yes.

Tableporter: That's what I thought.

Hanauer: And what would we be getting with that additional month that November 5th – the additional time we are asking for ... as reported in the staff report and in *Amber Waters, The History of Brewing in Minnesota* book recently published by Minnesota Historical Society, there were 86 tied houses as of 1908 and an article from the ...

Chair Larsen: 86 Gluek?

Hanauer: 86 Gluek tied houses in Minneapolis. We've seen 15, approximately 15 or so on the map, I apologize I don't have the exact number, but I can count them up on the map. And we did see some nice images of those provided by the applicant, but not images of all of those that were shown on the map. What kind of condition, we wanted to see what the exterior of those other buildings looks like today, so a photo documentation of those

remaining tied houses would be helpful for us to make the final recommendation on the demolition of the historic resource application. And the dates, images, and how many of those buildings still remain.

Chair Larsen: Does that answer your question? Ok, Other questions? Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Hunter Weir: This is one of those things that troubles me a lot because it raises to me the larger question whether we are talking about heritage or architecture or architecture as one expression of heritage. And so like the gentleman who spoke, I don't buy last one standing as an argument for demolition for others. We wouldn't have a Warehouse District if we had one warehouse. We wouldn't have Milwaukee Avenue if we had one railroad worker's house. And I think that there is something to be said the fact that the context has changed, my neighborhood lost 300 houses. You lose a lot of your history. What happens is if you look at architecture as an artifact that supports history, you know, history not being a thing, something that is supported by arguments, architecture is part of the argument. You keep destroying it, you have no argument. So, to me there is a much, much bigger question here, whether this is the best example, the interior is interesting, but not necessarily relevant. We have a playwright center that once was a church. You don't have to be a rocket scientist to look at it and see what it was, you know. So to me, I would like more time, I think, to think about this and to see what other information is out there, particularly in the surrounding community. I mean I'm not an expert on this area, but I do know quite a lot about it and this is not a building I think we should sort of dismiss because it is not the American Swedish Institute.

Chair Larsen: Ok, anyone else? Who wants to go first. Ok, Faucher.

Faucher: I don't really have that much to say other than I agree with Commissioner Hunter Weir. It troubles me, I understand that much of the integrity has been lost, but it does seem that a collection of these is part of what makes them significant. And I know it is not our purview to review the building design, but to me it seems like if you want pedestrian scale, this is a pedestrian scale building and that this could be, you know, that the development could maybe be stepped down and accommodate some more compatible scaled portions of the development that would relate better to this building, as, you know, one approach. But I realize that's not what we are here to discuss, but I just wanted to point that out.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Lackovic.

Lackovic: I had all of those same comments, but in addition to that, not a surprise, in addition to that when we talk about context and the lack of context as a reason to take this building down but then we talk about moving it someplace else as a justification .. to me that argument doesn't work very well either. In fact if I were going to move this I would probably move it across the street because then it is closer to its context and its got a front next to it that is sympathetic. But, looking at the projected phasing plan, that building's heading out too in phase 3. So I struggle with the concept of moving the building. I think, like you point out, \$400,000 to move it when it is perfectly fine where it is seems like an expenditure that no one is probably going to be willing to make. I guess my sense is that, you know, there is strength in numbers for this. It is not about the integrity or the quality of the interior space ... rarely do we designate interiors, but that it is part of a bigger picture of development and without having the dates or without having the time to really process that and see how that fits in to the bigger picture, I have a hard time saying no, let's just move it or let's get rid of it. It is a nice little building, I think there is ways of working around it. I agree with the pedestrian scale comment that, I mean the arguments that you put forth sound really good but to me this actually works better than the five story building that comes out to the corner. Stepping it down, allowing more light to come in from the south, there is some advantages in maybe trying to work something around this building. So I guess I'm not ready yet to say I'm ok with getting rid of it. I think I would go for the continuation.

Tableporter: I will second that if it is a motion.

Chair Larsen: It did almost sound like a motion.

Lackovic: So I would like to make a motion to approve staff findings, so the motion would be to continue the demolition of the Gluek Brewing Saloon for two cycles, to the November 5 hearing.

Chair Larsen: Alright, so we have a motion. A second to the motion?

Tableporter: I second it

Chair Larsen: Ok, Commissioner Tableporter, thank you. Additional discussion on the motion? Alright, seeing none, we will call the roll.