

**Excerpt from the
HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING
Community Planning & Economic Development (CPED)
250 South Fourth Street, Room 300
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1385**

The following actions were taken by the Heritage Preservation Committee on July 28, 2015. The Heritage Preservation Committee's decisions on items are final subject to a ten calendar day appeal period.

Commissioners present: Mr. Paul Bengtson, Ms. Laura Faucher, Mr. Alex Haecker, Mr. Chris Hartnett, Ms. Susan Hunter Weir, Ms. Ginny Lackovic, Ms. Linda Mack, Mr. Dan Olson, Mr. Ian Stade and Ms. Constance Vork

Committee Clerk: Fatimat Porter 612.673.3153

ITEM SUMMARY

Description:

**Item #6- Lowry Hill East Residential Historic District (BZH #28544 Ward 10)
(Alexandr Young with John Smoley)**

The Department of Community Planning and Economic Development recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission and City Council adopt staff findings for the local designation of the Lowry Hill East Residential Historic District:

A. Historic District Designation.

Action: The Heritage Preservation Commission recommends the City Council **approve** the local designation of the Lowry Hill East Residential Historic District subject to the following conditions:

1. The Lowry Hill East Residential Historic District includes the 55 properties listed in the designation study.
2. The designation includes the entire exterior of the buildings.

Aye: Bengtson, Faucher, Haecker, Lackovic, Mack, Olson, Stade, Vork

Nay: Hartnett, Hunter Weir

Motion passed

TRANSCRIPTION

Alexandr Young presented the report.

Chair Faucher: Thank you. Are there any questions of staff? Commissioner Hartnett.

Commissioner Hartnett: It says 55 properties. Is that 55 structures? I mean does that include the garages as well?

Staff Young: The parcels, so I guess altogether, I think technically we're supposed to exclude the Gluek House because it's already listed, that would be 65 contributing structures. But garages

are secondary structures. And they are only contributing if the primary building is. There are some garages that were built in the period of significance that are not considered contributing because the main house is not.

Commissioner Hartnett: Then the second point is designation includes the entire exterior of the buildings. Is there, does it make sense to say anything about the garages, the contributing garages or anything so that it's inclusive of that. I'm not sure. Maybe I'm being too picky on it.

Staff Young: It could be revised for greater clarity.

Commissioner Hartnett: Maybe a point of discussion.

Chair Faucher: Alright. Any other questions of staff? Commissioner Mack.

Commissioner Mack: I want to take this opportunity to commend staff for these three designations. This one's been a long time coming particularly. Thanks also to the council person. It's a really kind of wonderful collection of them. And we really commend you. Good work.

Chair Faucher: Anyone else? Commissioner Olson.

Commissioner Olson: In the comments I saw a few people who wanted to be included in the district but they said that they were not. Do you have any comments about those?

Staff Young: Commissioner Olson, members of the commission, during the nomination hearing, this commission asked us to study houses, properties in the district and that's mostly what we studied. We did a little research to see when houses were built and if some were designed by architects but we just focused our resources on this and to expand the boundaries of the district as we understand would require essentially another nomination to come forward.

Chair Faucher: Ok. Commissioner Haecker

Commissioner Haecker: Did you say seven; was it seven that were potentially eligible with light restoration. I forget the term you said exactly but.

Staff Young: Yes, Commissioner Haecker, members of the commission; that is correct.

Commissioner Haecker: And they are all within the district?

Staff Young: Correct. They're all within the district boundaries. Again, some of them its siding issues or. It's in the designation study. If you want I can pull it up for you.

Commission Haecker: No, I think I was just curious. What would be the process if this gets the local designation, would that mean they would need to amend the district?

Chair Faucher: Good question.

Staff Young: That is a good question. Maybe John can speak to this.

Staff Smoley: Commissioner Haecker, Madam Chair, members of the commission, the study identifies 45 contributing buildings, 10 contributing garages and 55 properties on 54 parcels. As Alexandr noted, seven of what we are deeming, recommending be deemed as non-contributing properties are non-contributing due to alterations that have occurred over time that appear to have, those properties appear to no longer their integrity due to those alterations. Having said that, we've heard concerns of property owners who've commented; and who've said that with some work, the properties in the area could certainly be restored to at some point contribute to a district of some boundary. So we tried to write in the designation study, we tried to leave open the door for those seven non contributors at this point, to should they be properly restored, to allow their integrity to be re-evaluated in the future. The district itself when it gets into the resolution, that goes to the City Council and when it gets to the motion before you this evening, doesn't actually break down contributors versus non-contributors. We have the study itself with non-contributors listed in there and a provision that should properties be restored, they technically be re-evaluated. That's something that can occur at the staff level, but having said that, when you designate something as a non-contributor that means that we are willing to let that go. And should a property owner come in and say, you know restoration is not for me, I'm going to propose a new building on site. That is acceptable, based upon the design guidelines, the standard design guidelines that we establish at the local level and that the Secretary of the Interior establishes as well. Of course, any new construction will have to be deemed compatible. It would still have to follow design guidelines. But when you call something a non-contributor, you've agreed that because it no longer retains its integrity or maybe some other reason, that demolition could occur on site.

Chair Faucher: And just to clarify that demolition would not come through our review because it's already been determined ineligible?

Staff Smoley: Technically, Madam Chair, that would, you've seen several in the past. Hilary Dvorak brought a recent one to you that was in the Warehouse District, where you still did review that demolition. It was a non-contributing property, something was proposed for construction on site. Because it wouldn't actually be a demolition of a historic resource, it'd be a certificate of appropriateness in the district, to alter a property in the district.

Chair Faucher: Ok. Thank you for that clarification. Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: My question just got more complicated. I was thinking of it. It seems to me the people who might have concerns about houses that are either non-contributing and perhaps they want them to be. Or people whose house falls outside the district. My understanding is that, the folks outside the district could still nominate their own properties. Am I correct about that?

Staff Smoley: That's correct.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: So, then the question becomes, who would do the study? Who would be responsible for conducting the study on those homes?

Staff Smoley: Commissioner Hunter Weir, Madam Chair, members of the commission; technically, that would be staff. I mean the commission could direct the planning director to

prepare or cause to be prepared a designation study. I estimate, in vision that would be staff if you're talking about an expansion of the district's boundaries itself to include another property there, having said that, you would still have to go through the full process. Someone, one of five parties can nominate properties. Those nominations would have to be deemed complete by staff, brought to you the commission, you'd have to approve them, direct the designation study be commenced, we'd have to send it to the State Historic Preservation Office, the Planning Commission, you, City Council, mayor, etc. That could certainly be we can certainly cross that bridge when we get there. Having said that, you know, in the backs of our minds, we're always trying to keep in mind your wishes, and the recommendations of the various evaluations that we've had thus far. And I think it's important to note that we have had two reconnaissance level evaluations. One intensive level evaluation, this will be the second intensive level evaluation we've had of the area. They are recommending this particular category of property or this particular group of properties be designated. In fact we've already expanded the boundaries once since 2005. So I do feel very confident moving forward, recommending to you all that you recommend to the City Council, this set of properties be designated.

Chair Faucher: Alright, thank you. Does that answer your question? Commissioner Hartnett, do you have something else? Was there any other question of staff? Alright, thank you very much, both of you. We will now open the public hearing on this time. If there is anyone that wishes to speak for or against it please step forward. State your name and address for the record.

Kathleen Kullberg (2437 Colfax Ave S): In the proposed historic district. I have comments and recommendations based upon reading the description of the proposed historic district, which I'm going to call PHD for short. I would like to recommend five additional structures of the seven that they are recommending as non-contributing. I'm excited to be part of the historic district. But again these recommendations would be to amend the dates of the PHD to go to 1916. This will allow for one house to be included. To allow for the presence of architectural styles to include the Arts and Crafts and early Prairie styles. This would recognize the importance of those styles in the PHD and allow for the inclusion of another four homes. And also to allow for the inclusion of a presently non-contributing property located directly across the street from me within the PHD at 2432-34 Colfax Avenue South. First, the street car era actually went to 1954. The peak ridership was from 1919 to 1923 so therefore I recommend that the dates be extended to 1916 to allow for future expansion perhaps of some of these homes that would like to be contributing. Secondly, it's well known Prairie school architects William Purcell and George Elmslie were very actively influencing the area within blocks of the Lowry Hill district. We know that they built the Purcell-Cutts House, the Catherine Gray House in 1908 and the Powers House in 1911. Progressive thinking people who were moving into Lowry Hill and Sunnyside were also perhaps, not thinking they wanted the ever pervasive Colonial Revival or they wanted the Queen Anne style. They wanted something more contemporary, more modern. Hence allowing the Arts and Crafts and Prairie style would allow several homes to be included and make the district more contiguous. I do have a handout for you afterwards so you can look through this. There is a precedent to adding the Prairie style to the district. The building that is the apartment building at 2317 Bryant Avenue South is a three story building and it has more features in line with the Prairie style than it actually does with the colonial revival style. Note on house 2321 Colfax Avenue South is a brick two story plus prairie style. It was built in 1913 by Frank and Edna Fridley Brasie as a brick veneered dwelling in the emerging Prairie style. Frank Brasie was an inventive and creative man. He was forward thinking. Probably drove his wife crazy, because he was always changing his occupations. But between 1913 and 1916 he actually was

manufacturing the Packet Motor delivery trucks, which was one of the first delivery trucks to be used for groceries, etc. that ran on engines. And I have a story about the Brasie Packet cars attached here also. Again he was progressive. The fact that this house was overlooked by previous studies doesn't surprise me because they also overlooked two of the Harry Well Jones houses. They overlooked the RP Russell claim shanty and they RP Russell farm house at 26th and Bryant among others. 911-915 West 24th Street is a wonderful home that's clearly, kind of a transitional house between the Arts and Crafts and what I call Victorian Cottage style. Presently it's painted black but it does have some wonderful architectural features. And per the PHD recommendations, it says, although built during the period of significance and appearing to retain the majority of its aspects of integrity, this house was built in the Craftsman style therefore it is not contributing. If we allow the Craftsman style, Prairie style then this wonderful house would round out the boundaries as the northern end of Colfax and 24th Street. And third, even though (???) I would submit that the late Victorian frame house across the street from me at 2432-34 Colfax should be included. This was built in 1895 for businessman James McIntosh, with James McLeod as the architect who was later associated with Lowell Lamoreaux. McIntosh sold the home in 1902 to Frederick Stowell. Stowell was then secretary of the Northwestern Knitting Company which became Munsingwear. Stowell became president of Munsingwear after he moved from this home and he was residing in Kenwood. So it has some significance to not only the building itself but also to the person who lived there. It's an imposing structure, it has rounded half-moon porches. It's on a double lot. It really lends a lot of presence to Colfax and is one of the show stoppers when you do walk down the street. I know there were some changes but every house on Colfax has had changes. And I've outlined several of those in the handout as well. Particularly there was a house at 2425 which is a farmhouse. Which was the first building in the neighborhood built before 1884 and it has had significant changes with stucco, the porch removed, duplex with the façade on the front and a rear deck added in 2014. So I still propose that this house at 2432 be considered. Lastly, I'm concerned, like you mentioned Commissioner Weir, that, what about the non-contributing properties? They're in the middle of the block. What if they decide to tear down? What if they decided to build something modern? What jurisdictions do we have, and I'm pleased to hear that there will be some guidelines established. But we can't necessarily demand that they do what they want to do with the house. And this would destroy the integrity. There's an example in here on 2416 Bryant Avenue South that in 2013 was ravaged by a fire, its right in the, like the third house in the block. And this owner could have chosen to destroy it and demolish it. He built a contemporary garage; he could have built in that style. In this case, he actually chose to restore it and he made it even better. So I just urge you to consider recommending, extending the district to include those properties that were built in an earlier time and make some guidelines to make sure that they maintain the integrity of the block. Lastly, I have a note that the correct spelling of the owner of 2412 Bryant should be Gottlieb Schober not Scherber. It occurs twice in here. His son actually lived in a mirror image house on Colfax and both are on the nomination. And again, that the garage at 2416, being contemporary, should be considered non-contributing even though the house itself is. I will have these handouts for you. Do I give them to you? Any questions?

Chair Faucher: Thank you very much. Please state your name and address for the record.

John Katies (2323 Bryant Ave S): And I am in the district that's being proposed. The project as it came forward in 2008 was discussed by several of the neighbors and it was considered divisive since there were some many non-contributing that weren't included in the neighborhood. And nobody ever came back and analyze, nobody wanted to put money or effort into expanding the

district or analyze expanding beyond what was done at that point. And at that point this was left to die it seems like. And now this has come, sort of again, like a steam roller. And on some of this process, even though I'm in the district, I haven't been always involved in it. The June meeting, I got the notice for the meeting after the meeting happened and this meeting. Somebody threw a stake sign in my front yard, so that's how I found out about it. The whole process felt like a steam roll to avoid opening and reanalyzing the district to include more properties. Also, since I'm on the northern edge of it where the spike goes up, there's a seventies blonde brick apartment across the street from where I am. They could tear that down and put larger buildings with current projects in the area. Trying to limit somebody to three stories is difficult now days. The developers often go higher. There's no real advantage often times for somebody making the sacrifices of maintaining their house. Time and expense to maintain their house when adjacent properties could be knocked down and non-contributing properties could turn into large apartment buildings and overshadow the district. And most of the properties are already R2 or R2B. And I would suggest, pulling back from this and looking at it deeper. To have something that includes the community better instead of a myopic project.

Chair Faucher: Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak for or against this item? Seeing none, we'll close the public hearing. I'm wondering if we maybe have more questions of staff. If any commissioners do? Or just have some discussion? Commissioner Hartnett, why don't you go ahead?

Commissioner Hartnett: I think that it's a terrific study that's been done and I'm excited about the district. And I'm also quite interested to hear the (???) researched information from Ms. Kullberg. Thank you very much for doing that. And the other gentlemen, I'm sorry I don't remember your name, John, from the district. It seems to me, I guess I'd like to hear, I'd like to talk about it a bit and also hear it from staff a response to that. It sounds like residents of the district are trying to make it cohesive and potentially opening the criteria a bit too additional designers and builders and make for a more cohesive district. I think this is a discussion I'd like to hear. And then I'd also like to get staff's input on the potential to take this back and investigate these properties as well as any others.

Chair Faucher: Thank you. Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: I love historic districts. This is kind of a where you draw the line and what you include becomes very difficult and divisive indeed in neighborhoods. It can be. And the reason I'm concerned about, I'm concerned about resources and somewhat reassured by what Dr. Smoley said. I did a preservation project for my own neighborhood just this last weekend for a festival and found out that we have over 500 buildings in Midtown-Phillips that are 100 years old or older. I don't know of anybody who lives in my neighborhood who could afford to do a designation study if they had to contract it out. And that includes me. So, I am concerned about the process for expanding the district, i.e. by including other properties, but also offering some protection to valuable historic homes that fall outside of the lines. So that the process is such, and I understand that they have to do what everybody else has to do. But that the resources are there to support people who want to pursue that as an avenue. That would be my concern is that people have somewhere to go if they feel like their homes should be included either in the district or considered as an individual landmark. I don't mean landmark.

Chair Faucher: Any other thoughts? Other discussion? I for one am thrilled that there are people clamoring to get into the district. We rarely have that happen. I'm thinking maybe staff can address a little bit more about the period of significance that was selected and some of the things that were raised.

Staff Smoley: Certainly. Madam Chair, members of the commission. I don't actually have a copy of the packet in front of me. Staff has not actually received that yet. We did upfront talk to property owners as early as the September 22nd meeting and did state to them that, if anyone felt additional properties should be included in the district, that they could come to us with that information and we would definitely take that into consideration as we prepared the designation study, regardless whether the properties fell within the boundaries or not. And we didn't actually receive that. We did receive one request from one property owner outside the district. I'm trying to remember the address right now. It was two houses east on Aldrich. And she requested her property be included in the district. She was the one property owner who requested her own house be included in the district, and that was outside of the boundary. At the September 22nd meeting there was also a request that there be a smaller dis-contiguous district of houses associated with cheese maker P.C. Richardson, that those be included as well. Those were a few, block or two north of the proposed district, but we never actually, that was just sort of suggested at that initial September meeting and we did not hear from those individuals again. And I'm not quite sure if they were the property owners or not. The period of significance currently is recommended to end at 1913. That was what was recommended in 2008 as well. That could certainly be expanded several years. It could certainly be expanded to include additional architectural styles, like the Craftsman and Prairie styles and that would include several more residences in the district. We had one Tudor influenced home that might also fall into that same category. Expanding the period of significance and the architectural styles definitely opens up the possibility that other residences might be included in the district should at some point in the future, the commission or some other nominator, direct us to prepare an amended designation study. Sort of the way we did with the Warehouse Historic District several years ago. But I think it's important to consider that within the other priorities that the commission has. I know when we came to you all last November to discuss our proposed study for this year, the under documented groups series of designation studies, that we heard you all give us a vote of confidence for that moving forward. Thank you again for that. You expressed some concern about Homewood and Golden Valley Road. I'm pleased that we have been able to or are addressing those concerns currently. As well as some properties that we were not able to address at this point, some modern resources, specifically Cedar Square West, Ralph Rapson's bank over in southeast Minneapolis. Hopefully as time goes on, the commission, other nominators will have the ability perhaps through the designation subcommittee to sit down and prioritize some of those request; having said that, within the boundaries of the district tonight, it's well within the commission's ability to recommend that changes be made to the study. Recommend to the Council that changes be made to make some properties contributing that are within the boundaries, other properties non-contributing, or vice versa, expand the range of architectural styles and the period of significance as well, should you choose to do so.

Chair Faucher: Can you just talk a little bit about the period of significance that was chosen though. Because I'm sure there were good reasons for it and I would imagine that expanding to include other styles, while, I'm personally, of course the more significant buildings we can save the better. But once you expand the time frame I would imagine then the, does that affect the integrity of the district? Like this is the majority of the styles and so, to have one or two here and

there is kind of inconsistent. But maybe start a little bit more with why the 1913 period was selected.

Staff Smoley: Certainly. That was recommended in the 2008 study and the evaluators at that time, and we concurred with their determination, that was when the majority of the Sunnyside and Lyndale Avenue additions were developed. This district was part of those two additions and part of the significance of the area is related to that street car related development pattern between 1882 and 1913 is when you see the vast majority of development occur in this area. We did prepare a map, if we could switch over to the document camera that identifies development within this particular portion of our city. Properties in red were constructed in 1913 and earlier. Properties in yellow were constructed after 1913. So we did concur with those initial recommendations that 1913 be the end of the period of significance since that is when the vast majority of properties in the district and in the surrounding area were constructed. Extending the period of significance by an additional three years will have an impact upon contributing, what could be considered a contributing or non-contributing alteration to a historic property. We're seeing that in Dinkytown actually, with the amended period of significance there. Being shorter, some of the properties that were initially identified as contributing resources, did, through 1972, did have a lot of alterations between 1929 and 1972. So at the staff level, we're working hard to try and address some of those concerns by taking a closer look at some of those contributing versus non-contributing determinations. But with a period of only three years, the relative number of alterations that occurred in a residential historic district that was quite frankly very new, those are going to be pretty minimal. I can't imagine there are going to be too many negative impacts that would suddenly have negative repercussions. The idea of including Craftsman and Prairie, personally I love the idea, it was very hard for us at the staff level to take a look at some beautiful buildings and say, whelp, nope, we're going to stick with very strict period of significance, a strict number of architectural styles, here a variety of architectural styles and cut it off there. But, point, when you walk through this neighborhood, it is kind of overwhelming. The high quality Queen Anne and Colonial Revival styles that you see, and as much as I love the example that we have of a Craftsman building there, and a Prairie building, they are fairly different in terms of their form itself, and since there are only one or two, staff recommended that those be excluded and we focus on the Queen Anne and Colonial Revival styles.

Chair Faucher: Alright. Are there any other questions of the staff? Commissioner Mack.

Commissioner Mack: Well, I guess I'd just like to say, it looks like a really coherent district has been suggested and that I'd like us to move forward on that and make sure that there is a process for looking at that and adding other things; adding other houses that are renovated or whatever. It's great to see it have come this far. And I'd like to I guess make a motion. Or are we still discussing? Can I make a motion that we accept staff recommendation and the findings and call for the local designation of the Lowry Hill East Residential Historic District?

Commissioner Lackovic: Second.

Chair Faucher: Thank you Commissioners Mack and Lackovic. Commissioner Vork.

Commissioner Vork: I have a question for staff. I'm wondering what if any practical difficulties would result from extending the period of significance to 1916 and allowing for Prairie and Arts and Crafts styles to be included?

Staff Smoley: Chair Faucher, Commissioner Vork, member of the commission; very few.

Commissioner Vork: Excellent thank you.

Chair Faucher: Can I follow up on that real quickly? But if we were to do that, that would probably involve some rewriting of, I would imagine of, the nomination. I mean to include those particular buildings?

Staff Smoley: Madam Chair, that's correct, we could go back through and identify, reevaluate, contributors or non-contributors based upon a condition of approval that you apply to the designation study. Right now I believe there are two, one or two, conditions of approval. You could certainly alter the period of significance; alter the architectural styles that are considered contributing to this. Then we can go modify that for the Council's consideration, first at the Zoning and Planning Committee on August 13, and then at the meeting of the full Council.

Chair Faucher: Ok. So procedurally we would not see it again necessarily it sounds like.

Staff Smoley: Not unless you continue the item.

Chair Faucher: I just wanted to make that clear. Commissioner Hartnett.

Commissioner Hartnett: Another question for staff. What's your sense of, kind of the integrity of the district if we open it up? I mean, you talked a little bit about the Prairie style and Arts and Crafts, pretty significantly different architectural style. What's your sense on that? Does that bring in something that doesn't, is missing the intent of the district?

Staff Young: Commissioner Hartnett, Madam Chair, members of the commission, if I could editorialize I would say no. I think it's great to have an eclectic style of architecture. And again, by looking at the 2008 as a part of our intensive research, we found a lot of errors. Where there were just quite frankly a lot of mistakes. And I think the more intensive level study that we've got and the conversation we're having now I think we could include more contributing properties within the district that would allow for more eclectic changes, changing the period of significance. But if I could just speak to it, we just tried to keep a rigorous methodology while doing this because this was a very messy process; in a good way. And I think, what we thought about was that if you designate too much, if everything's special, then nothings special. And if you walk around this district, you really get a sense of being at the turn of the last century. Whereas there's really harsh edges where you see apartment buildings from the 1960's that take up half the block that are sandwiching a couple of houses. You really, I think the district is more about feeling and association, than it really is about individual buildings. And it's the whole that is greater than the sum of its parts. So I think the boundaries are good. But I think altering; rewriting, research and study to change the period of significance and include more architectural styles would be acceptable.

Commissioner Hartnett: So if I could continue with the discussion based on that. I mean I think that what I'm hearing the reason to move forward is because we've got a designation study and it's a good study. And we're excited about that. And the other piece is that staff time is at a premium and potentially pulling resources away from other studies or priorities. But I think, from what I see in front of me, the study that was given to us; a lot of research has been done. It sounds like staff is open to doing that and in my opinion we've got two neighbors who've come here and said, no, we want to be part of this. So it seems to me that if we as the City say no, we're going to go ahead with what we have, and not listen to their request to be included in this and potentially going forward moving with staff to improve the communications. I'm hearing that potentially for one reason or another that information is not passed along and wasn't communicated, then if that could be improved then we can incorporate properties within that district. I don't see why we wouldn't continue this and ask staff to look at the recommendations that were given to us.

Chair Faucher: Alright. Commissioner Vork.

Commissioner Vork: I agree. I am so excited about this proposed district and so grateful to the council member for nominating it and to the neighbors that participated in all this amazing research and staff. It's so exciting. It's the neighborhood I grew up in and it's really fun to see. Of all the times that we have property owners come before and get upset with us about the potential nomination of their properties. This is an instance where we have community members and property owners who are excited about this and want to see it expanded. And with staff saying that this is possible to do, I think it's a no brainer that we expand period of significance and the architectural style at a minimum to be as inclusive as possible.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Bengtson.

Commissioner Bengtson: So the two folks that were here this evening, just for clarity, your homes are already in the district correct? So you're not asking to be added to it. You're asking to expand what's considered to be contributing, what's non-contributing. To me, the current boundary, the current study that was done, it's such a high concentration of the homes, if seven more of them could potentially be brought to contributing through some rehabilitation work, you're looking at three or four houses within a historic district that wouldn't be considered contributing and that's an extremely high threshold I think. To me, if you can expand the dates for the period of significance, I would also want to have a look at the surrounding area, to determine, does that mean there are areas that are currently outside of the historic district that would be inside of it. I voice opposition to changing the period of significance based on that fact, because of the high concentration that's already contributing within the district. The very unique nature I would say of a historic district being potentially 99% within the period of significance is important I think.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Lackovic.

Commissioner Lackovic: I would agree with Commissioner Bengtson on this one and I think that's what the motion was driving at. And it's one of the reasons I seconded the motion is that, there are certain historic districts that are charming because of their eclectic and there others that are important because they're very specific. And I think this one, having that high concentration of the Queen Anne style, its different, it's really, really special. That's not to say that the

surrounding area couldn't be incorporated in a broader district. But I think this one really does stand on its own. And as we've seen from neighbors, there are a lot of other structures here that are important, maybe not for the same reasons that this particular boundary was drawn. But it's possible that there may be an overlay district that could be developed on top of this. But I would hate to dilute the historic district as purposed now to included things, just to include them. Because we feel sorry for them, poor 2424 Bryant, which is in the middle of everything and it's the only one not contributing. It's unfortunate. But I think that there is such a strong argument for a very specific set of criteria and a very tight date that I think it stands on its own. But I encourage people who have buildings that they think are important and think merit additional research, let's think of a way to bring them into a larger overlay district. I don't think we should stop here, but I think that this one stands on its own.

Chair Faucher: Thank you Commissioner Lackovic. Any other discussion? Commissioner Stade.

Commissioner Stade: Yea, I would agree it is a really strong compact district. I personally would love to see it go up to 2200 Bryant so the Anita Stinson, Let It Be, Replacement's house would be in it. The thing about extending it to 1916, if we look at what happened with Dinkytown, that got, we had an extension of a certain amount of time and then it got pulled back after it left our commission. So that could happen anyways. So I think we should go with what we have in front of us.

Chair Faucher: Thank you. Commissioner Vork.

Commissioner Vork: Thank you. Respectfully I'd like to disagree with a couple of points that were just made. Our role is to assist in the preservation of historic resources. And to the degree that this district opens up the door to other potential landmarks, I don't see that as a bad thing. And as far as additional styles or newer homes diluting the district, those homes are there, so when someone walks down the street, I guess the districts already diluted by their presence. I don't know that it dilutes anything to place additional protection to maintain the cohesion that exists today. Those are my two cents.

Chair Faucher: Anyone else? Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: I always find these arguments kind of troubling. And I sort of take the point about architectural cohesiveness, but I come at as a historian so I have kind of a different spin on this. Neighborhoods are always in transition in some fashion or another. So the Craftsmen houses, these newer houses, although not newer by much, say something about the district as well that I think is important. And it certainly helps that they were built by fairly prominent people, for prominent people, by prominent builders. So, I get troubled with the idea that history can be fixed. You know, that it is a fixed point with a start and a stop date, particularly when it comes to defining neighborhoods. I don't know where you go with that. That's what troubles me.

Chair Faucher: Alright. So far I haven't heard any sort of friendly amendment and we do have a motion on the floor. So unless someone proposes to make one to change that, alright, it looks like Commissioner Vork would like to do that.

Commissioner Vork: Sure, I would like to offer a friendly amendment if the motioner is open to amend the period of significance to extend to 1916 and to add the Prairie and Arts and Crafts styles to the styles.

Chair Faucher: Is that favorable?

Commissioner Mack: Unfortunately the motioner doesn't consider it a friendly amendment. It just feels like history on the fly to me. And so, my motion stands as is.

Chair Faucher: Alright. Thank you. We have a motion on the floor. I think we should just call the roll and see where we are.

Aye: Bengtson, Faucher, Haecker, Lackovic, Mack, Olson, Stade, Vork

Nay: Hartnett, Hunter Weir

Motion passed