

**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 May 03, 2016. The Heritage Preservation Committee's decisions on items are final subject to a ten calendar day appeal period.

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

Commissioners absent: Mr. Dan Olson

Committee Clerk: Fatimat Porter 612.673.3153

ITEM SUMMARY

Description:

Item #6

**200 Central Avenue Southeast and 113 2nd Street Southeast, Ward 3
Staff report by [Janelle Widmeier](#), BZH 29057 and BZH 29058
This item was continued from the April 05, 2016, HPC meeting.**

The Department of Community Planning and Economic Development recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission adopt staff findings for the applications by Alatus, LLC for the properties located at 200 Central Avenue Southeast and 113 2nd Street Southeast in the St. Anthony Falls Historic District:

A. Certificate of Appropriateness.

Action: The Heritage Preservation Commission **approved** the certificate of appropriateness to allow the demolition of two buildings in the Saint Anthony Falls Historic District, subject to the following conditions:

1. As mitigation for the demolition of the Saint Anthony Commercial Club building, a photographic recordation of the property shall be prepared and submitted to staff that is in accordance with the guidelines of the Minnesota Historic Property Record.
2. The developer will make the Commercial Club building widely available (through a website or other means) for a period of six months to allow the options of relocation for reuse to be explored.
3. By ordinance, approvals are valid for a period of two years from the date of the decision unless required permits are obtained and the action approved is substantially begun and proceeds in a continuous basis toward completion. Upon written request and for good cause, the planning director may grant up to a one year extension if the request is made in writing no later than May 3, 2018.
4. By ordinance, all approvals granted in this certificate of appropriateness shall remain in effect as long as all of the conditions and guarantees of such approvals are observed.

Failure to comply with such conditions and guarantees shall constitute a violation of this Certificate of Appropriateness and may result in termination of the approval.

Absent: Olson

Aye: Bengtson, Hartnett, Lackovic, Mack, Stade, Vork

Nay: Hunter Weir

Abstain: Faucher

Motion passed

B. Certificate of Appropriateness.

Action: Notwithstanding staff findings, the Heritage Preservation Commission **denied** the certificate of appropriateness to allow a new 40-story building, based on the following findings:

1. The building would not be compatible with the adopted guidelines.
2. The scale and height is not consistent with the guidelines.
3. The building is not compatible with the historic district.
4. The setbacks to the adjacent contributing property are deficient.
5. A taller building detracts from the historic structures.
6. Impact to natural environment also needs to be considered e.g. Mississippi River flyway for birds.

Absent: Olson

Aye: Bengtson, Faucher, Hartnett, Hunter Weir, Lackovic, Mack

Nay: Stade, Vork

Motion passed

TRANSCRIPTION

Staff Janelle Widmeier presented the report regarding the certificate of appropriateness lettered A for demolition.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Stade.

Commissioner Stade: I just wanted to clarify, in the 1980's it was not torn down because it was historically significant by the standards of the National Registry?

Staff Widmeier: That is correct. They determined that it would not be appropriate to remove it from the designation, or the...

Commissioner Stade: But that stopped a project in the 1980's?

Staff Widmeier: There wasn't a project proposed. It was just a general, for district wide analysis of amending the boundaries because it is a very large district. So they wanted to shrink that down a little bit. They did actually remove the residential area over here because that had been destroyed, its integrity was gone. But all the other boundaries remain intact.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: speaking off of the mic

Staff Widmeier: This one or the building photo?

Commissioner Hunter Weir: The building photo. Do you know when the parking ramp was built? When I look at this, I see one thing is not like the others. And to me it looks the parking ramp. So I'm curious about that.

Staff Widmeier: I believe it was constructed in 1980 if my memory serves me correctly.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Vork.

Commissioner Vork: Thank you. Do you have any detail on the investigation of moving the building? Like was, it was too expensive to move it where, and by whom. How was that process sort of developed?

Staff Widmeier: The applicant contacted a building mover and got an estimate. So that letter was included in the staff report attachments. And by moving the building, you of course would have to find a site. So you have to purchase the site and to minimize the effect on integrity, you try to find something close; if there's no property for sale in the immediate area that kind of makes that a short search. My understanding from the applicant is there wasn't an option to pursue for moving it plus the additional cost that would be needed for rehab.

Chair Faucher: Anyone else? I have one further question just about the integrity of setting. The integrity of setting for this building has been significantly impacted and I would agree that several newer buildings have been constructed. But my concern is that, now that this building is removed, how does that impact the integrity of setting of the Pillsbury Library. I know the Godfrey House and Chutes Square.

Staff Widmeier: And that's where the new construction would have to be evaluated for compatibility with surrounding areas.

Chair Faucher: Now I guess maybe I didn't state it correctly because I guess my question is how does removing one more potential historic resource or contributing member from this district not impact the overall setting of the district. As we go through and evaluate integrity of setting in all of our certificates of appropriateness. It seems to me it would impact the Chute Square and Godfrey House and the Pillsbury Library. Because it's just like whittling away at what's left of the historic fabric.

Staff Widmeier: Staff concluded that this wasn't portraying the significance of the district. We didn't go into that analysis too much. But if it was considered to be contributing to the district and defining a stage of growth of the district, then it would have, you would conclude that it would have an impact on the integrity of setting.

Chair Faucher: Ok. Alright, anything else? Then, if you want to go ahead with the new construction. We'll do it this way and then have the applicant also present and then the public hearing. Even though we have two separate action items, we'll take public testimony on both together similar as we're doing too for the presentations by staff and the applicant.

Staff Janelle Widmeier presented the report regarding the certificate of appropriateness lettered B for the new construction.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: I see that there are 207 apartments and about 417 parking spots. Are all of the spots in that building for the apartments? Or are some of those set aside for retail? How does that work?

Staff Widmeier: I don't know the exact way that they are split up. If they are, we look more closely at the parking during the zoning review stage, but they may all be for the residential. They may be for the residential. That's information that I don't have yet.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Lackovic.

Commissioner Lackovic: I have two questions. How are we defining high density for this? Because I'm looking at this and with an average of five units per floor, doesn't seem real high density to me. It has building density at 40 stories but high occupancy density not so much. So, I'm just trying to figure out, high rise and high density is not the same thing in my opinion. So I'm just trying to figure out how we're, they name is being thrown around a lot, high density. And I want to know how we're defining that.

Staff Widmeier: High density as far as number of dwelling units goes would be up to 800 units in this location, the general category would be up to 200 units per acre. But this proposed density is at 257 so it's in that very high density range.

Commissioner Lackovic: The other question I had was key views seem to be very restricted to what's happening within a block or two distance of the proposed site. And I would say that the key views that haven't been considered are the ones from the west side milling district. Stone Arch Bridge back across towards the Tile Elevator and the Pillsbury 'A' Mill. I look back at other environmental assessments that were done for other proposed new construction in that area and key views were from every angle and from all different places. And quite frankly we're going to see; well we would see 40 stories from St. Paul. So I'm thinking that there are other key views that we should be considering back across the river from the Minneapolis side. Did any of that, was any of that, did you guys look at that a little closer?

Staff Widmeier: Right, in the guidelines there is a diagram showing where key views are indicated in the district. So looking from the west side, there were no views indicated

looking towards the site. And to your point, it will be visible, we know that. It will extend above the height of the building. So to the east of it would be the Winslow Condominiums, we know it's going to be taller and will be visible.

Chair Faucher: Anyone else? We'll turn it over to the applicant then.

Bob Lux (201 S 11th St): Good afternoon Madam Chairman, commissioners. We've been working on this project for a couple of years. And we've been before you twice in informational meetings and you guys have been very helpful to us. We've had not countless, but close to 20 various meetings with neighborhood groups, association boards of the various memberships of the neighboring buildings, the Marcy-Holmes neighborhood, numerous people. This is a difficult job for you guys, we recognize that. It's a difficult job for a developer to try to do one of these projects. It's a fun job for the architects and all of the consultants that we put on them. But I want to be brief in my presentation because I want to turn it over to Aaron Roseth and Gretchen Camp from ESG. But I want to assure you that through all of these meetings, the reasoning that we're going after this is that it's an important building, we believe, for the City of Minneapolis. We believe it from, really from the bottom of our heart. Otherwise we wouldn't have tried for this for two years. When we started with this, it was going to be a 25 or 30 story apartment building with 350 plus units. And after meeting numerous times with neighbors, they really pushed us towards condominiums, towards homeownership, toward a higher quality building, toward LEED certification, toward, you know, higher fees to the City, and a whole lot of, I can't tell you all of the discussions that have been had. But we've listened to a lot of them. We can't satisfy everything. This is a tall building, we realize that. Marcy-Holmes in the last vote that they took right before the first of the year voted 12 to 3 in favor of the building. And in that approval they stated that they wanted that density on this site. They didn't want throughout their neighborhood but they want it on this site. We have a time in all of our careers that we can do stuff and make a building like this potentially work and work to the benefit of future generations, not just the ones that are sitting in this room. And what we really tried to do, when staff talked about pre-cast, actually the base of the building is all limestone. And you're going to see when Aaron and Gretchen come up, many of the staffs concerns we agreed with. And we have incorporated into the new drawings that you're going to see this evening. But I think it's important to have the eye on as your listening to the presentation of what will this building be in 50 years when the next HPC commission or the generations from now is looking at it. And our hope is, with sincerity, every meeting that we're in, what will make this building more spectacular. Whether or not it's that little cantilever out because it's interesting; we believe it's interesting. I understand staffs position but we think it's interesting. But we want to make this spectacular. We need to do it also from a variety of housing options. There's only one other condominium project that's being built in Downtown Minneapolis right now. And that's over on Portland. They're not having tremendous success. It's not running off the door. The developer that was here early, Mr. Gunsbury, a very good friend of mine, at the last informational meeting where we appeared, they had gotten approval from you that evening to do a condominium project up by the Star Tribune building right across the street from where they're building an apartment building. They marketed that building for six months and it didn't work. If you're

Heritage Preservation Commission Meeting – Minutes excerpt

going to do one, if the City of Minneapolis is going to make one of these work, and I spent 15 years doing them, I know what works and what doesn't work. You have to do something that's exceptional. And it's up to us as community members to figure out where those exceptional sites are and where those exceptional buildings can be. And it's not perfect, we know that and what we'd like to do is to work with you, work with staff and make this building as best as it could be. And that is our sincere hope. And with that I would like to turn it over to Aaron Roseth and Gretchen Camp to go through the details of the building for you. Thank you very much.

Aaron Roseth (500 Washington Ave S): Good evening. I'm with ESG Architects. I'm here with my partner Gretchen Camp. And we're going to go through very quickly; Janelle always does a great job kind of communicating the big picture of what we're proposing for the project. I want to talk specifically about some of the nuances that will lead into our request to talk about some of the conditions of approval at the end of the staff report. So, as Bob stated, we've had an unbelievable time doing this. As he said the architects are having fun. But we love and believe in what we're doing completely. We have looked at the guidelines, both the strategic plans of Minneapolis of growth, and where growth needs to happen. And many different goals that the City has to increase density in the city and believe this is a very good site to do it on. As some of you have already talked about in your comments and questions, we're next to a really ugly parking ramp. And we are hoping that we create a beautiful bookend to that. And hopefully with some of the improvements that are being proposed right now, eventually the rest of that skin around the other sides can be improved as well and help this area. From the two meetings that we've had with you we talked about a micro perspective and a macro perspective. And as one of the commissioners has stated already, we look at this as a Twin City project. We could probably see it from St. Paul and frankly we think that's a good thing. The context of where this exists amongst two very tall towers between LaRive and Pinnacle could be called a missing tooth if you look at it from across the river. We like the undulation of height from a macro perspective. We think that it is context sensitive. And as we get closer to the street many of the guidelines determined numerous decisions we made in terms of creating a beautiful podium. Their related to the pedestrian and related to the vibrancy and activity along this street. Unfortunately the towers that exist there now are big and bold and tall. But they don't meet the street the way that we're proposing. And I think your guidelines and other strategic, other guidelines within zoning are shaping the way that podiums can exist and towers can exist in these areas. So with that, we'd like to go through the conditions of approval. And we'd like to specifically address and ask you to reconsider the staff recommendations for items two, three, four, five, six, eight and nine. In this presentation we're going to talk about the nuances of those and the way that we would like to continue the conversation with you. Items one and seven, we'd like to suggest you allow us to continue to work with staff. We have a suggestion, and I know you don't like to design on the fly and reconsider these things on the fly but we asked and we've made a big effort to improve items one and seven. And we ask that you allow us the opportunity to continue to work with staff on those items. Then items 10, 11 and 12 we agree to those and don't feel any need to discuss them unless you do. So I'm going to start with item one. This was an interesting point that we talked about a lot. It came up in one of our neighborhood meetings with Marcy-Holmes. And one

Heritage Preservation Commission Meeting – Minutes excerpt

of the architects had said, he appreciated what we were doing on the podium, loved the ground floor, the porosity of it, and the retail presence along it. And suggested that because Central wants to be more active, we're doing that with the ground level, that perhaps we would reconsider what we were doing on the upper floors of Central. So we took that back into the design discussion internally with Alatus and all the professionals that have influenced this design thus far and said let's do it. We eliminate parking and made it a little less efficient within the place. By the way, there are three levels of underground and three levels above that are wrapped if that didn't make sense so far.

Gretchen Camp: And the total parking is 333. I think there was a little confusion on that; so 207 units and 333 parking stalls.

Aaron Roseth: So what you see here is our suggestion for item one that we would wrap that and continue it over into 2nd. So we agree to that finding with what we're suggesting here.

Gretchen Camp: And again we are suggesting that we would continue to work with staff to flush out item number one.

Aaron Roseth: Items two, three, and four. We think that those go hand glove together. What we're trying to present here with the porte cochere and the entry sequence is that we're creating a very tall volume of outdoor space that happens to have a cover over it. The success of Carlyle and the porte cochere that Alatus did and then the recent example of Latitude 45 that we did with Alatus; there are so many successes of this. One you're taking busy traffic for a thriving retail restaurant off of Washington and allowing both valet and people being dropped off to be done safely. The restaurateur that owns this attributes much of the success of that entry is their front door as much as it is for the residential and again really attributes part of his success to that front door I'll call it. So, on the site plan again it easier to see this from perspective but I know many of you can read plans very well. The idea is that we're entering off of 2nd and we can drive through and pull through that area, have a bypass lane, have valet exist there, but that whole area becomes the front door sequence. Can we go back to Latitude? One of the things that we're really proud of with this project is Bob had told our interior designers to actually look at the entry sequence of this area and the materials that we were doing inside, he suggested early on that we pull those out and make it warm and inviting and comfortable. And that's the idea of the canopy extending out, that's the idea of the front door being setback and the drive thru being part of all of that entry sequence.

Gretchen Camp: Staff is recommending that the building be pulled within 8 feet of this property line and as you're seeing here we're about 30 feet back. Basically our goal of designing is that you're entering the project at the curb. So really as Aaron said interior design and architecture and landscape architecture with David Motzenbecker, this whole area, similar to how you experience Latitude is right when you're at the curb is when you're entering the building.

Aaron Roseth: So practically many of those reasons are, we have inclement weather nine months of the year or so. And the more that we can reintroduce the indoor to the outdoor and have that auto court type area and porte cochere. We believe this is a great solution for that and a great way of activating the street even more than just putting retail. But connecting the people that are in that building and connecting the activity of people wanting to participate in that building on the restaurant level as well happening in that one zone.

Gretchen Camp: So this image also relates to condition number five which is talking about canopies on the project. Similar to what we showed you on Latitude that canopy really starts at the building face and projects all the way out onto Washington. That's what we're proposing here. It's something that's continuous. Comes from within the porte cochere and brings some very interesting articulation on 2nd Street.

Aaron Roseth: So very much like canopies highlight front doors to buildings, whether they're hotels or residential. This is a large canopy that is introducing the front door. And it just happens to include a variety of other activities and support mechanisms for the project. So that's condition five. Condition six; do you want to start on that?

Gretchen Camp: Condition six talks about the tower not being pulled back off the podium on the north property line. As Janelle went through the numbers, the podium is setback at the furthest edge anywhere from 11.6 to almost 12 feet. And it would be fairly easy for us to just extend the podium to kind of capture that but we feel like this articulation pulls the building away from the building and the podium if you see on first floor here, this wall is part of the building that could easily go up and capture the podium. But we feel like this solution is much better for the building to the north, providing a much greater setback. And then we just have a one story service entry on ground floor.

Aaron Roseth: So condition six also relates to condition seven. And this is the alternative design approach that again we're asking you to allow us to continue to work with staff. We carried the primary building material along Central which is limestone. And just so there's no confusion we aren't proposing precast on this area at all. This lighter color might have been a little bit confusing on the material boards but the concept is that looking at the context of limestone and different stones around this area, including the Pillsbury 'A' Mill. The idea is that we're using a textural quality to this elevation and the elevation on 2nd. What I mean by that is, a variety of sizes and shapes as well as flat surfaces, rough surfaces, we think that that's a great complement to the overall bigger context of this area with the limestone.

Gretchen Camp: So this image here is showing you the previous north elevation were we transitioned to a different material here. And then this iteration is our, again our next iteration that we'll continue to work with staff on to wrap the material that's on Central to the north elevation.

Aaron Roseth: And some of my comments right now are also going to relate to condition nine. In this elevation we think that it's a really important thing to do contrast between what we're doing with the tower and the podium. We're still bringing many of those colors from the tower portion into the podium. Especially the metal panel as it relates to the ground floor retail and what not. The base of that or the podium part is all clad in limestone. And then the glazing both of the lower podium and upper area, the tower portion would relate as well.

Gretchen Camp: We can start to talk about condition number eight with this image. Because you can see the railing that we're proposing, the glass railing on Central and then it's also proposed on 2nd Street. This is really, if you can see the people on the edge, this is really to bring people to the edge of the building. That experience is just dramatically different when you have that glass rail and you're right on the edge. To us it really activates and brings eyes on the street for 2nd and Central.

Aaron Roseth: We've talked to you about this in other projects we've brought to you in the past. We believe that's an important thing with a podium. The concept of it is to bring it to the human scale, to the ground level, in the pedestrian realm. And that upper terrace amenity deck we think is a great opportunity to also bring the activity there and the vibrancy there and not set it back and hide it, but bring it to the street.

Gretchen Camp: Right, you'll actually be able to see activity up there versus a parapet of stone where you have no idea of what's going on, on that fifth level.

Aaron Roseth: Lastly item nine, the color and finishes of the proposed exterior wall shall be similar in historic context. So we looked a lot at the contrast of materials and the different colors and what not. I think one of the best examples is the relationship of the Red Tile, which is very bold color in contrast to the 'A' Mill, the white grain elevators, the industrial steel buildings. There's a texture and a contrast which I think is striking and beautiful. Also the Winslow House, the monolithic sort of presence of that. So we believe a contrast amongst the podium relating it still compositionally with color by bringing it, some of those finishes and colors into the podium but making the tower stand out and be bold. So, that concludes sort of what our request is. We appreciate you listening and we are here for questions.

Chair Faucher: Any questions of the applicant? Commissioner Lackovic.

Commissioner Lackovic: Talk about activating the street on the 2nd Street side. How does the porte cochere do that? I'm seeing absolutely no way for pedestrians to interface with that part of the building. It's very much about cars in and out right? I'm looking at the plan and I'm trying to figure out how safely do people, you just scoot in with the cars?

Gretchen Camp: Commissioner Lackovic, I actually live right by the Carlyle, I live about two blocks from the Carlyle, I walk by it every day to go to my office on South 2nd Street. As you can see, there's a pedestrian here, it's a very inviting, friendly experience. That's my

personally experience with the Carlyle. I'm giving that as an example of how this project will be designed as well.

Commissioner Lackovic: This ones got a screen wall in front of it right? So you can't get through there.

Aaron Roseth: In front of that is a sidewalk.

Gretchen Camp: You're walking right here. Does that make sense?

Commissioner Lackovic: No I understand that but then to get to the entry for the building you have to go through where the cars are coming and going right?

Aaron Roseth: So very similar to Latitude 45 and the Carlyle, the sidewalk would be on both sides of the drive lane.

Gretchen Camp: Its curb less, its papered, so really actually pedestrians, much like Latitude pedestrians have more of a, I was just walking through there last night, they have more of a right-of-way than cars do.

Commissioner Lackovic: The second question I had is the roof top deck amenity area open to the public or is that for residents only?

Aaron Roseth: It's for residence only. And I apologize we do have one more speaker as part of our team; David Motzenbecker who can also talk about this from a landscape and urban design perspective as well. So we will be here for questions as well.

David Motzenbecker: Chair Faucher, commissioners thank you my name is David Motzenbecker with Cunningham Group doing the landscape architecture on this and also one of the actual main things I wanted to talk to you about was a little bit of the idea behind some of the memorialization of the history that we were doing here. I can answer any questions with some of the site work. There might be some options that we can look at there. One of the things we're really excited about is being able to memorialize this piece. And there was a piece in the packet about this. Through a process that puts stuff on your phone. And I don't know if I could get this underneath the visual. But this is an app with a developer that is working right here in Minneapolis and it's called **Leave**. And what it does is it allows public art to be present in a temporal and spatial setting. So each one of these dots, I zoom in here, are different art pieces that exist. Here's kind of right around the spot right here. This one is an art piece done about the church bells at Lourdes Church. What's interesting about this is you can only access the art when you're standing within this purple circle so the spatial aspect of being in that purple circle. These are all over Downtown right now and they're spreading them across the country to other cities as well. And one of the things we were thinking is that we could use this to create a virtual gallery that really showcases the history of this site as well as perhaps commissioning art that would interpret

in different ways. And if you, you can all download this if you have Apple iPhones, check it out. One of the things that it does is you can do song you can do video you can do pictures and one of the beauties of it living online is you can add to it continually and enhance it with things. And we'd be open for recommendations on some of the components that maybe perhaps should be seen in this. I know staff has already recommended some certain things on the interior of the building maybe some of those similar things can be put forth in this. We like this idea and we think it would be a really unique precedent setting way to look at preserving history in a way that is accessible to most everyone. With that if there are any questions about that I can answer it or if there's any site questions I can answer those as well.

Chair Faucher: Any questions? Thanks. Does anyone have any more questions of the applicants? Commissioner Stade.

Commissioner Stade: I just wanted to; Minneapolis Historical is also an app that could be used to preserve the history.

Chair Faucher: Nothing further for the applicants? Then we will open the public hearing. If you wish to speak state your name and address for the record and we will again be timing for two minutes.

Chuck Liddy (3932 Richfield Rd): I'm representing Preserve Minneapolis tonight. We did send a letter last month when the project got continued. I'm not going to repeat all that, I just have a couple of things. One of them goes to Commissioner Lackovic's question regarding density on the site. Again our information is taken from public records. We'll use an error of 5% in either direction but based on our calculation, the original Nye's project, which is not being built, it's been changed, was 189 units on .46 acres, 411 units per acre. The Pinnacle is 261 on 1.64, its 159. LaRive is 118 on .5, its 236. Alatus is 207 on .54 and its 383 based on our calculations. So that gives you an idea on the type of densities now we're talking about. We can't think of where else there might be densities that high possibly Cedar Riverside or else in Downtown. And that's one of the questions that we have too is regarding both the floor area ratio and the density issue in regards to the zoning ordinance, which is beyond your purview but it's something that we think that needs to be discussed. The other thing I want to talk about is the height. The guidelines, the historic guidelines do say as demonstrated that additional height should be compatible with adjacent properties. The most proximate higher buildings are the 9 and 12 stories that were cited previously. And the taller portions are setback significantly from the street. 6 to 14 feet is basically from me to you and then to the wall and along the podium, that's to me not a significant setback. There really wasn't any major staff opinion that would support the much greater height that is being presented. And the one thing I will also say is I was chair of the HPC when the Pinnacle and the Falls were built and if you want any history behind that, I'd be happy to provide that to you. Thank you.

Chair Faucher: Thank you. I think maybe what I'll do is when you have about 20 seconds remaining; I'll just raise my hand.

Arvonne Fraser (110 Bank St SE): I lived in the Marcy-Holmes area for about 63 years. I'm now in the Nicollet Island East Bank neighborhood. And both those neighborhoods have new master plans or revised plans and small area plans calling for more density. I live now in the 28 story LaRive, about 30 years old. I served as president and land use committee chair of the Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Association from 2007 to 2012 and as I said I'm pleased to have had a part in updating that master plan in accordance with the City's goals which call for increasing housing density and promoting economic growth along the transit corridors. We have the two big transit corridors, Hennepin and Central. You have to cross the bridge to get over here. So I come to support the Alatus development. In the 1950s living in a house built in the 1880s I often took my small children to the Pillsbury Public Library at University and 4th Street and shopped in the busy East Hennepin and Dinkytown commercial areas. In those days one didn't walk down Main Street, especially at night. And sadly I also recall seeing many homeless lined up for food at the Salvation Army distribution center about where Nicollet Island Inn is now. We should all be proud of what historic preservation and this City have done to continue and save and convert unused industrial sites for new uses. So, I come as I say in support of the Alatus project. It will be a very welcome addition. I get the bus just across the street from this proposed project and I would say a fair amount of pedestrians do use 2nd Street and as I understand it, there will be plenty of room for the pedestrians to get to the bus stop. This proposed development will be a beautiful anchor at the end of Central Avenue, 3rd Avenue from this side bridge, an invitation for more people....is my time up? Thank you.

Lisa Venable (3917 2nd Ave): Madam Chair and commissioners, my name is Lisa Venable and I represent the Minnesota Citizens for the Protection of Migratory Birds. A group of concerned citizens with Audubon Minneapolis who believe this building proposal affects not only heritage preservation but avian preservation. The proposed 40 story tower appears to be designed completely with transparent glass which is a bird death trap, if you heard about our efforts at the Minnesota stadium, right along the Mississippi River it potentially kill thousands of migrating birds who navigate along that area. I don't know if you realize that almost half to a billion birds die every year in North America alone because of building collisions. Migratory birds are extremely valuable and protected by Federal and State laws. Fewer species decreased by our diversity the healthy balance needed for our environment to thrive. The unnecessary death of millions of birds is a tragedy as birds pollenate plants and control insect populations. All this affects human beings and our way of life. We need to start collaborating with nature versus building more structures that get in its way. Sadly many architects believe bird safety doesn't fit with the aesthetic vision of their design. But is aesthetic preference worth killing precious wildlife? In 2012 the Minnesota DNR prominently raised this issue as part of an environmental impact statement urging all new buildings to include bird safe glass in their designs. All over the country more and more buildings now use this glass and often there are no complaints with visibility. One other issue for migrating birds is tall buildings with bright lights. And this design also looks like it

will emit a lot of light. All downtown office buildings graciously follow a lights out policy during migration season when birds fly at night. But I'm not sure a residential dwelling will do the same. There's going to be a day when we will finally feel the impact from the loss of our natural world. So I thank you and the citizens' thank you for doing the right thing and stopping the current design of this building.

Chair Faucher: Thank you.

Andy Brehm (45 University Ave SE): I live at the Cobalt which is right near this site. I'm a congregant at Our Lady of Lourdes Church. And I'm very excited about this project and to possibly have these folks as my neighbors. I'll say this, right now on my walk home from work I walk past a very ugly area that I think would be much improved by this building. I love my neighborhood, I love the restaurants, I love the retail that we have. But the only way that we can support that and grow that is by having more residence. We can't have those kinds of things that I love and not have more people moving into the neighborhood. There's a dearth of housing in that area as well; my parents, I'm not sure I necessarily want them living as close to me but they wanted to move into the neighborhood but there's nothing available. Well I guess I kind of kept them out for a while. I think they'd probably be good additions to the community. Anyway from my perspective as a condo owner at the Cobalt, I think this is a great idea. I think it is a beautiful tall building. I know heights been an issue but the reality is we already have two, what I consider, very ugly tall structures in the area. I think this would be a nice addition to that. So I'm excited about it and as a potential neighbor very supportive. Thank you.

Chair Faucher: Thank you.

Nicole Mardell (404 8th St SE): I've been a board member of the neighborhood association for two years, a land use committee member for three years. And during that time I've been able to see the progress of the 200 Central application. I would like to again mention that the Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Association has voted in favor of supporting this project three different times, the most recent vote supporting specifically the 40 story height design. Although height continues to be a point of contention with our neighborhood, the land use committee and Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Association are in support based on the specific context of this site and the beneficial amenities that result from higher densities such as increased transit service, increased pedestrian activity relating to both safety and economic sustainability of that corner. And it will also serve as a noticeable beacon and gateway to our neighborhood, drawing more people in from Downtown. Another thing that I want to mention is the lack of diversity in our housing stock in the neighborhood. Right now the neighborhood association is forming a housing diversity task force because our housing stock is limited to mainly smaller multifamily dwellings and older single family homes. Adding a 40 story, multifamily condo development would add a great amount of diversity to our neighborhood and would be beneficial for the future. Thank you.

Chair Faucher: Thank you.

Jake Steen (8300 Norman Ctr Dr): Good evening chair and commissioners. I'm with Larkin Hoffman Attorneys and we represent a large coalition of neighbors and for that reason and because you've combined the public hearings I would request a little bit more time tonight. I will try to be very brief but we want to make sure that we have a complete public record. Two applications, the first is the demolition of the St. Anthony Commercial Club or the Washburn McReavey funeral home and you do have two reports in front of you. Both have been commissioned by the applicant at different times and both have come to the same conclusion. Essentially that a portion of the Commercial Club at least was is eligible and is likely eligible to be a landmark under the HPC's guidelines, and as a standalone landmark separate from the contributing structures from the district. The first is the 2012 Hess Roise report that was commissioned. And that again concludes that this is likely a landmark on its own. The second is the 2014 Landscape Research report that was submitted with the application. So why is this important? Because as Chair Faucher pointed out, this is an area of diminished historic fabric. And to further use that reason as justification to do more damage is nonsensical. And approving this CofA would just do irreversible damage to this district. The second application is concerning the construction of the 42 story tower. And it is 42 stories and it's very important to note the conspicuous absence of any analysis governing policy 10.8 from the St. Anthony Falls guidelines. While staff did mention it, that policy says that building height here on this property should not exceed eight stories. And this is a problem because a 42 story building is more than five times that eight story maximum. I think it's very important to note that moving forward you're going to see a lot of applications coming through in this area. The market is hot. There's a lot of undeveloped area. But these guidelines were adopted with several policies in mind. Stopping damage to this National Landmark, preserving the integrity of the district and ensuring the future development is consistent with the birthplace of Minneapolis. So I think it's important that you don't turn your back on the St. Anthony Falls guidelines. And that you don't send the message that you can do this here so you can do it anywhere. So for those reasons we would ask you...I don't think there's anyway you can mitigate a 42 story building. So we would ask you that you deny it as it's proposed. Thank you.

Farida Kathawalla (Eden Prairie): I am here to speak about supporting the plan for building a high rise of Alatus development on Central Ave. This council should approve this plan and continue to make progress and to further our city goals of growth and development. This in turn encourages blossoming vital and livability communities and maximizes the utilization of existing infrastructure.wants to attract business and professions leaders to live and work in Minneapolis or surrounding area. The type of resident Alatus will attract are people who will support culture, charitable education, church and other organizations. They will support local commerce and they will pay local taxes. This will further enhance Northeast compared to what it was 20 years ago when I first moved to Minnesota. I was afraid to step into Minneapolis area. Today I want to come live here. It's because of the bold development that takes place, taken place, and makes Downtown become a hot place to live. Instead of going to Lake Minnetonka or suburbs I'm attracted to this area of the nature; easy living, accessibility, theater, good restaurants. And I feel the building that Alatus, Mr. Bob Lux and his whole management is proposing is a state of the art technology. Keeping it green in

every way with energy conservation and using state of the art in building products. I believe in his quality of workmanship and product. And I don't think you will be disappointed giving him this opportunity to build an iconic building in northeast Minneapolis. Thank you.

Erick Wunderlich (413 5th St SE): I live in a historically significant home in the Marcy-Holmes neighborhood which is in the 5th ST SE Historic District. I'm a member of the Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Association. I own a business in the neighborhood. I'm here today to speak against the HPC approval of the certificates of appropriateness for the Alatus LLC proposal for 200 Central Ave and 113 2nd St SE in the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. When we bought our house in the historic district we understood that we were bound to an additional layer of regulatory guidelines. This was made abundantly clear when HPC staff rejected our permit application to install skylights. We were ok with this. We've made substantial investment in historically appropriate renovations in our home. We appreciate that the neighborhood and the City value preserving the important heritage of historically significant assets in the community. That's why I'm objecting to this proposal. It's not that it's a bad building or that I object to the idea of development, it's that this project is completely out of character for the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. And is an affront to the idea of preserving the heritage of the river front. Not to mention it is completely out of compliance with the St. Anthony Falls district design guidelines. There's an argument to be made for an even handed and fair application of the rules. But there's also the precedent that this would set. The City has adopted a comprehensive plan, neighborhood small area plans and historic district designing guidelines in order to provide specific long range planning advice free of pressures of projects currently under construction or proposed projects and in large measure to avoid past mistakes. Again the Alatus project is out of compliance with all planning guidance. If the project were to go ahead, what's to stop high rise developments from going on at sites the length of the historic district? This is exactly the project the guidelines anticipate and reject. The City's Comprehensive Plan calls for high rise residential development in the downtown core. Why is it we continue to have mid-rise stick frame apartments Downtown? Why isn't the Alatus project going where it belongs in the Downtown side of the river? In its rush to achieve density, it seems the City has lost all sense of livability. Back to the point, HPC is charged with upholding the historic guidelines we've agreed to and to do its part to preserve the heritage of our urban community. For the St. Anthony Falls District, the historic mills define this character, glass skyscrapers don't fit. Thank you.

Jeff Wright (178 Bank St SE): Good evening. I live at 178 Bank St SE which is Lourdes Square, about 120 feet from this proposed development. I'm here to speak in favor of preserving the historic nature of St. Anthony Falls Historic District where I live and specifically about the potential environmental impact of the construction of this 40 story or 42 story development. My neighbors and I think it is unfortunate, very unfortunate that the need for an environmental assessment worksheet was rejected for this large project by the City Council. We think it was irresponsible given the scope of this project in this particular district. I'm appealing to you as stewards of our historic neighborhoods to reject the appropriateness of this development on the grounds that inadequate environmental study

has been done on the potential negative impacts to the district. No independent environmental study has been done here as called for in the City guidelines. We have significant concerns about the environmental impact of this project. Just a few examples, air quality, I don't know if its 414 or 333 new parking stalls, the number seems to be moving but, whatever the true impact of additional vehicles on air quality in this congested area is somewhat unknown. In our petition for the EAW we cited a 2013 study by the National Institute for Health which essentially talked about the escalating health risk of additional vehicles in congested areas. Essentially kind of a tipping point, there's an accelerating impact especially in areas that have high congestion or slower or variable traffic. And traffic in general has an impact on the quality of life with congestion, noise and potential pedestrian accidents. This has been a historically friendly, walking friendly area. There are infrastructure issues, there are storm water runoff issues, there are wild life issues, shadowing effects, there are many other things and I'll keep it short. All of this needs to be kept in context of the cumulative potential affects to this district and potential future developments in the area. So given the scope of the project, the stakes involved and the irreversibility once it's built, we believe you must err on the side of caution when assessing the impact of this development. To trust the developer's studies as adequate is not enough. We should respect the law of unintended consequences and be really armed with the best potential information in cases like this. In conclusion given that at the current time and independent EAW has been rejected, we're appealing to you to reject the appropriateness of this project for this historic district. Thank you.

George Carlson (110 Bank St SE): I live at LaRive, I've lived there for 25 years and I'd like to see this project go forward. I like to see the people move into this project enjoy the next 25 years like I've enjoyed the 25 years at LaRive. He mentioned environmental. I used to live in Eden Prairie, if I still lived in Eden Prairie in the 25 years that I've lived at LaRive my wife and I would have driven about 200,000 miles more. That a big environmental imprint. 25 years ago there was not much around this neighborhood. There weren't hardly any restaurants, there wasn't much commerce, and there wasn't much of anything. It's gotten better and better. But it can get better still if this building is built and we get more people there. It's good for Minneapolis and Minneapolis goals, more walkability, more density and it's also good for the tax situation. I've got three points I'd like to make beyond that. The first is sightlines. This building is not going to affect anybody's sightline that a nine or ten story building wouldn't affect the same way. In other words, from the ground on University Ave by the Union Bank or by Union Bank parking lot, a nine or ten story building would block the view the same as a 40 story building. Another point I'd like to make, the picture we had up there that showed, apparently from the 3rd Ave Bridge it showed LaRive and it showed the new building. Really, LaRive didn't look that much shorter than the new building in that picture. Certainly the new building didn't dominate LaRive. They both looked like big buildings and they were comparable. The demographics is four projects going on now in the area. Three of them are probably going to attract renters, mainly younger people. This will attract a different demographic and I think that's good. And finally the Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Association vetted the project. The Land Use Committee had a meeting and everybody, not everybody but a preponderance of the people at the meeting and a vast

majority of the people on the committee preferred a 40 story building over a 35 story building. Thank you.

Katie White (730 3rd Ave SE): Chair and members, I live in Marcy-Holmes neighborhood, I walk by this site three to seven times a week. And I volunteer at the University of Minnesota so I spend a lot of time walking through the neighborhood as well on a regular basis. Marcy-Holmes has seen a lot of development over the last several years. It's been a lot of fun to watch. A lot of the development of course all must meet our requirements and regulations. However some of it just doesn't look very welcoming, appealing, like a great place you'd want to live. One of the great things about this site being located in an historic district is it allows us to have these important conversations and it requires the active participation of the developer. The developer has been a great person to have a conversation with throughout the last two years of this development. It's been a lot of fun to watch from the sidelines, I've not been an active participant. And I really appreciate the thought and effort that's been put into this project by the developer. The growth has been terrific and I would love to see this at such a prominent location on Central Ave. Marcy-Holmes plan calls for the development to not be concentrated so much in the middle of the neighborhood but instead take place at its edges where it is most appropriate along our commercial corridors and the river and where it can make a big impact for the larger city but a smaller impact on the single-family houses that are in the middle of the neighborhood. So this makes a lot of sense. My husband and I are home owners right now in a pretty modest place in Marcy-Holmes and we are committed to staying in Marcy-Holmes. We love the district and the neighborhood very much. However there's just not enough supply, not enough turnover in the neighborhood and so we would hope to in a perfect world become homeowners in this development because of the opportunities that this development would provide to us and to the neighborhood. Thank you very much.

Joanne Netland (110 Bank St): Member of Neighbors for East Bank Livability. My husband and I left Minneapolis in the 1970s to live in Connecticut and Arizona. And I returned here a widow about two years ago anxious to find a downtown condo in an area with some character and an appreciation for its history. The East Bank had great appeal. And best of all it would be protected by the well thought out St. Anthony Falls Historic District design guidelines updated in 2012 to limit future construction to low-rise buildings. It was time to preserve the historic character of the neighborhood. My concern is density. The East Bank is a small triangle of land about .148 of a square mile. There are seven major development projects that have recently been built, approved or in the planning stages. That's 700 Central Lofts, Red 20, those are new ones and then you know all the ones that are on the drawing boards. Alatus would be just across the street from the East Bank neighborhood. Latest figures have our East Bank population for this small triangle at 1302. If the seven projects are built we will have about 3550 in that same triangle of land. That's a lot of people to step into a small piece of land. And it doesn't include the number of workers coming and going into the area each day. There are four highways going in and out. The negative effects of quality of life would be significant. And what would happen to the historic character of this neighborhood? We know high density effects livability. The ??? it leads to more crime, environmental health problems, traffic problems, pedestrian crashes, construction damage to historic sites, air odor and noise pollution. So please give us buildings that are not overpowering at 40 stories and just simply don't fit in. As you see on the poster, it doesn't fit; it belongs on the other side of the river. They only add

density problems. Give us well designed low-rise buildings that preserve the character of our historic neighborhood. Thank you.

Dan Jacobson (110 1st Ave NE): Good evening I am a resident of The Falls Condominiums, two blocks away from where this project is to be built. I am here to offer my voice in support of the project. I think this building is going to be beautiful. It's going to be very attractive, contemporary design and I think it's going to add some great architectural diversity to our neighborhood. We're going to get 200 plus additional homeowners to the neighborhood. Which means 200 plus additional property tax payers which is always good news. Plus we're going to have 200 additional residents to patronize our local businesses. I think it's going to hide the very unattractive parking ramp that is currently there, that I see out my bedroom window every morning when I wake up. I think it's going to be the kind of building that you're going to want to show off to your relatives from Des Moines or Milwaukee or Kansas City when they come to visit the Twin Cities. I hope to see this project come to fruition. Thank you for your time.

Mike Ross (501 Main St SE): I'll try to go super-fast. Wow. I don't envy what you guys are going through. My wife and I are here and we're probably an example of the type of family and couple that would be interested in moving into this building. That is why we strongly support the project. We raised our family in the suburbs. The kids are up and out. We moved out of our house and sold it two years ago. We moved to Uptown because we thought that would be the next great life; go urban, have some fun and it was horrible. It was about the worst experience we could have had in our life. So we started looking around, it was a year ago, we went Downtown, we went into the North Loop and we went over here. And St. Anthony Falls and this whole northeast area is something very special. We had never seen the likes of it before. We spent hours and days coming down here because we were so scarred from what we had lived through in Uptown. The greenery around here, the restaurants, we got to know a guy named Michael who owns Pizza Nea and now he's a good friend of ours. The Italian place next door, the merchants on the streets, the Lund's, the grocery stores, everything else, this thing is something special here. We've ingrained ourselves in the community, I belong to Alchemy (?) and my wife belongs to a yoga studio. The problem is we're renting. We're in our second year of renting. There's about a 30-40% turn over in the building we're in Mill and Main, which is a wonderful site. But it's renting. So when we saw this building going up and we're aware of the Carlyle, it was like jumping for joy. These people know what they're doing. We hope that we can become an owner in that building. And I think the lifestyle of people like us who have kids grown and gone that it's our generation of people that would be moving in here and make what is currently a vibrant community even better. Thank you.

Dale Herron (110 Bank St SE): I've lived on the East Bank, what I call the East Bank for the last 19 years with my wife.; first at 148 Bank St and now recently in that ugly large building LaRive. My goal is to briefly summarize why people in the East Bank neighborhood are so vitally concerned about the direction the Alatus development would take this neighborhood. I also would like to focus on something besides likes and dislikes here and ask ourselves what are the rules. What rules do we live by? Now since 1850 St. Anthony, which is now the East Bank, has taken a distinctly different direction from the Downtown core. Any of you who read about it know that there was a nice competition between the two areas. As a matter of fact that's why the McReavy building was built; because the business interest on that side of the river wanted to make sure they were getting together and holding their own. It is character such as that that we're trying to preserve in our neighborhood. We have heard the word transformation, we've heard exceptional building, by the way I agree it's an exceptional building, I don't argue that. But this proposed transformation is wildly out of character for the historic district guidelines and rules. Zoning rules, regulations, there's nothing that it fits. And no one can tell me that there is no precedent. If this is approved that we

won't be lining up skyscrapers in the next 20 years up and down the river there. Now maybe that's what some people want. But many of our neighbors acknowledge the need to increase density. We want to use the corridors. We want to meet the density goals within the rules that have been established. Not what people are thinking are going to be the rules in the future. Thank you and please do not approve the conditional use permit.

Edna Brazaitis (4 Grove St): I live on Nicollet Island and I'm appearing for Friends of the Riverfront. I guess I want you to go take the 42nd story view of this. Because you are the people that should be as interested as I am in protecting historic resources in historic districts. First, you know, I think that staff is kind of arguing for a very lack definition of how you evaluate resources in a district. A district, each individual item doesn't have to be that significant. On Nicollet Island, none of those framed houses would be deemed historic. But as a collection of houses they have significance. So I think you have to look at that a little differently. And also, the guidelines are the only thing that stands between us, and I'll say myself, and oblivion. Because I live on the Grove St flats on Nicollet Island and when they proposed a nice building I ask city staff, well does it take a variance, what do you do to do to build a really tall building right next to me where there's a site twice as big as Nye's. They said all you need is a CUP (conditional use permit). So the only thing that you have to protect the historic resources for future generations is these guidelines. If you don't turn down what's completely out of character every other developer will say it's arbitrary and capricious not to approve my project. So I would like you tonight to say yes to historic preservation by saying no to this project. It can go somewhere else. It's a beautiful building but it doesn't belong in the district. Thank you.

Chair Faucher: Thank you. Anyone else?

Victor Graff(?) (132 Bank St SE): I live in Lourdes Square. I live 27 paces from the nearest point of this building, I was walking over here. I would just like to note that from Lourdes Square, I look out one way I see the massive Cobalt which literally fills the sky. I look out another way; we're literally in the shadow of LaRive big chunks of the day. The idea of that this building is out of scale with the neighborhood, it's not as though Lourdes Square is the only building here. Basically all the other buildings I can see from Lourdes Square are very big buildings. Not quite as big as this but there's not as though this building is three times the height of LaRive or something like that. So I also point out that Lourdes Square as a residential property is completely a historical, there was never anything like this. In any even Lourdes Square was designed to mimic townhouses in the Georgetown of the District of Columbia. How it ????? appears the historic structure is a great mystery. I'd like to point out also that density, the City plan for sustainable growth and increasing density is really the crucial way that we're ever going to have a sustainable city that will be environmentally friendly to live in. One of the people on the board, Leo Melzer, and he's been on the Island, he's been on East Hennepin Avenue ever since 1940 and he said, when I got off work in 1940, an interesting concept, he said the sidewalks were crowded and they're not now. Unless you get tied up in Mill City Runnings organized things, our sidewalks aren't crowded because we don't have enough people who live here. And these kinds of projects promote the right kind of living, high density living within walking distance of all the things that you would want to walk to. I'm strongly in favor of this project. I urge you to approve it. Thank you.

Duane Kell (45 University Ave SE): Good evening. I'm an architect and I live at Cobalt. Not too far from this project. In fact my unit looks right down on Washburn-McReavey site. I'm here tonight to speak against the project, against approval of this. Primarily because I don't think any of the questions that need to be answered about the historical appropriateness of this project in this area have been answered. And most of the comprehensive plan items are violated by the density

issues. I know this is personally for me I think it's a very nice building. I like it very much, I told the developer this and ESG is a good architect. But I do think that there's a point at which one has to say no to density. And this is the time. We've asked for an Environmental Assessment Worksheet on this to answer the questions we all have about what the impact of this will be on the neighborhood. And it's been denied by the Council. I can't believe that our Council won't respect an Environmental Assessment Worksheet. It doesn't make sense to me at all. This never would have happened ten years ago I know that. So I would like you to decide tonight to deny this request and to take a second look at the density of this project. Thank you.

Ron Vantine (45 University Ave SE): Good evening. I live in the Cobalt building. I just want to address one topic and that's the topic of scale and mass. There's a Latin term that we use in the law that I think is relevant here, Res ipsa loquitur. Res ipsa loquitur means nothing speaks for itself. This is the thing that speaks for itself. It's easy when you look at a massive blow up of a drawing that's attached to the staff report. And it speaks volumes about how out of proportion this building is to this historic district. A 42 story building simply does not belong in our historic district. It dishonors the human scale and historic fabric of this historic district which is anchored by such buildings as the Pillsbury A Mill, Pillsbury Elevators, the buildings one block away along Main St and the Pillsbury Library. Its height at 483 feet, it will be the 11th tallest building in Minneapolis. You'd expect that to be in the Downtown core. That would be logical. It does not belong in a residential historic neighborhood. Not only that, its shoe horned into a parcel of land that's less than one acre in size which is pretty remarkable in and of itself. Reference has been made to LaRive and Pinnacle. We need to address those. Those are both about 28 story buildings. However, in terms of their relevance you have to look at the context. They were built 35 years ago in an area which as some other speaker acknowledged was an industrial area a bit on the blighted side. Neither was within 16 feet of an historic building and they were built 25 years before these guidelines. The choice is not, we favor development of this site. The choice is not no development or a 42 story building, there's a whole lot of room in between. In closing, I would just like to emphasize that if this 42 story high-rise building is approved it will set a precedent that means there are no longer any meaningful historic guidelines for East Bank Nicollet Island part of the historic district. Many new high-rises will be built based on the precedent. If we approve this, we can approve these others whether they're 30 stories, 42 or 50. And soon we're going to become a neighborhood of dark canyons rather than sunny and inviting streets. In sum, I think our human scale of this neighborhood in this district will be lost. And I think that the human scale is a precious asset not only for the neighborhood but for the City and should not be sacrificed on the altar of density. Thank you. You know, by way of footnote sir, I hope the commission has noted a striking contrast between the recommendation of staff on the last project where they focused a lot on height and the importance of six stories and whether a mechanical something or other on top was six or seven stories. And yet on this 42 story building in another historic district there's no meaningful discussion of that topic and it seems to be happily ignored. I think that's telling and quite disturbing for those of us who believe in this historic district. Thank you.

Chris Coy (419 5th St SE): In the Marcy-Holmes neighborhood. I grew up watching Sesame Street as a child so my presentation is brought to you by the letter P. Now that's P for proximity as in one of the reasons my wife and I bought our lovely home in Marcy-Holmes is because of its proximity to Dinkytown and the U (of Minnesota), to Downtown and of course to Nye's. Of course Marcy-Holmes proximity to the U has meant that over the years as the University has grown the neighborhood has been forced to absorb more and more students. Today that means that only 10% of the properties in Marcy-Holmes are single-family owner occupied homes. And why does that matter? It matters because Marcy-Holmes strove to have that unifying sense of community that comes with getting to know your neighbors over the years. You see it is that strong sense of

community that gives your neighborhood power; the power to make choices, to direct its growth, to choose its path into the future. I joined my neighbors association to find community and to actively participate in the shaping of Marcy-Holmes future. Unfortunately instead of lessons in exercising of community power, I got an education and what it means to be powerless. I was forced to watch as developers bulldozed an entire block of Dinkytown and in its place constructed a lovely canyon of patchwork boxes. So once again, I am confronted by the same sense of powerlessness. However this time we have precedent on our side. In denying the developers of the Nye's property their 29 story tower, HPC has established precedent. And precedent is the power we have to preserve our historic neighborhood. Sadly polka will no longer play but Nye's will rest in peace buried beneath a sensibly sized six story building. Alatus must be held to this same precedent. This small corner of the City has done its part for density. We neither need nor want a 42 story tower. And the precedent its approval would have on the future of development of General Mills. So the final P in my presentation is preservation. I ask on behalf of my neighbors in Marcy-Holmes, the East Bank, Nicollet Island and Northeast that HPC deny a private a moneyed interest the power to defy precedent. And in so doing preserve our historic neighborhood.

John Brainerd (no address given): I'm a thirty year resident of Marcy-Holmes; member of Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Association and on the Marcy-Holmes Land Use Committee. I'll make it short. In the Marcy-Holmes master plan, we never talked about any building over 15 stories. Its true there was not a limit given but there was no discussion over a building three times as tall. This is your chance to stop an extension of Downtown into my neighborhood. This is your one chance to stop the precedent of buildings 40 to 60 story buildings going all the way to 35W. This is it. It's a historical chance for the next hundred years. I urge you to deny as proposed. And that's it. Thank you.

Chair Faucher: Thank you. Is there anyone else?

Lynnette Wittsack (2322 Taylor St NE): I'm a 24 year resident of Minneapolis. I come to as a former member of the Metropolitan Council. I'm no longer a member, I was appointed by Governor Pawlenty and I sat on the Environmental Services Committee. The role of the Metropolitan Council is to ensure the orderly development of our cities and to ensure the efficient use of all of the infrastructure. I fully support the development at 200 Central Ave because it really embodies what the Metropolitan Council is trying to achieve. It's using the sanitary sewer systems. It doesn't require additional infrastructure to be built in that respect. It doesn't require additional bus routes. It doesn't require any new roads or bridges be built or any biking or walking paths. All of that exist and we would be using it very efficiently. You know when I look at this stunning contemporary development; it is a development I would like to live in as soon as my youngest is out of high school. It will put more eyes on the street. It will support all of the local retail, restaurants and shops, grocery stores. And it will add a sense of vitality and vibrancy to the neighborhood giving it some stability and it will certainly not put a strain on city services. You know I remember growing up where the Foshay Tower was the highest building in Minneapolis. And I hope that, I guess we can see now that those people that made the decision to allow higher buildings to be built certainly knew what we were looking for. I would hate to think that we're going to allow a river to stop us from building this 42 story tower. And I certainly again lend my support to Alatus and what they are trying to accomplish here. Thank you.

Chair Faucher: Thank you. Anyone else? Alright, we will not close the public hearing. Commissioners, we have a lot to discuss as has been pointed out. And perhaps what I will do to begin with is just to remind ourselves, well, we all know we have two certificates of appropriateness before us, one for the demolition of the existing buildings and the other for the new construction.

And I'm just going to go through just kind of as a reminder to us all, because again there are some things that are within our purview and some things that are not. Although we do like to consider the communities input. So the first thing, for a certificate of appropriateness that we have to consider is whether or not the alteration is compatible with the designation of the landmark or historic district including the period and criteria of significance. Secondly the alteration will ensure the continued integrity of the landmark or historic district. Third, the alteration is consistent with the applicable design guidelines adopted by the commission. Fourth, the alteration is consistent with the applicable recommendation contained in the Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Five, the alteration is consistent with the spirit and intent of the preservation ordinance, applicable policies of the comprehensive plan and the applicable preservation policies in small area plans adopted by the City Council. And then additionally for findings for destruction we have to make the following findings, either one the destruction is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property. Which in this case they noted is not. Or two, that there are no reasonable alternatives to the destruction. And in determining whether reasonable alternatives exist, the commission shall consider but not be limited to the significance of the property, the integrity of the property and the economic value or usefulness of the existing structure, including its current use, cost of renovation and feasible alternative uses. So just kind of wanted to refresh our memories about those things as we launch into our discussion and also to recap that for the public because I'm not sure, the staff reports are quite meaty and I'm not sure how much everyone has a chance to review them themselves prior to meeting as far as the public goes. So with that I will, is there anybody that wants to jump in with some initial thoughts? Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: Here's something that I find somewhat disturbing; that the building is not unsafe. I came here thinking I did not care a great deal about Washburn-McReavy and its stylistic peculiarities but I've started falling in love with that idea. But the staff, everyone agrees that the building is not unsafe. Ok. That's something we're supposed to consider. Everybody agrees or seems to agree that it retains its integrity or much of its integrity. So really it's coming down to money. Is it the most profitable use of that building? And are there alternatives? And I was doing a quick run through of the history of funeral parlors as we're sitting here. The Volunteers of America is one, the Resource Center up on Franklin and Chicago is another. The ??? Brothers which is in Elliot Park is a third. All of these have been adapted to other uses. So these buildings do have value. What they don't probably have is huge profit attached to them. I'm not sure that's in our purview either. The question is could it be used for something else? I think the case could be made that they could. The second building is a little dicey. I think just for aesthetic reasons it's not a very attractive building and it's a little bit harder to see. What I'm concerned about very much is the erosion of the idea of the historic district. If we ignore these guidelines and say, well yeah it's safe and yeah it has some integrity, but it's not a money maker. I think we're on a slippery slope that I don't want to be on. It makes me very uncomfortable. And also, I've said this before at other information sessions, the City spent \$75,000 developing those guidelines. There was huge input from developers, from realtors, from residence. It took a year or more to come up with those guidelines. And I think that should matter. I'm a big fan of neighborhood organizations. I participate in my own. But as we all know they are not always super representative and I don't mean to write them off as that but there was a process here. And that's how those guidelines were developed and I sort of think they should mean something about our role in how this whole thing plays out. So I'm somewhat inclined to step back, you know, because all the arguments are persuasive. Parking is, trust me, I live in a terrible parking, the issues, that's kind of what I was kind of smiling about responding to people living in Uptown and the issues that they face. But that kind of isn't our problem either. So that's just my thing. I don't know how we can say that the building is not unsafe. That it retains its integrity and the problem is it doesn't make enough money.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Hartnett.

Commissioner Hartnett: I would, are we going to discuss each of these separately? I would argue that we should.

Chair Faucher: I think that's fine. I mean we have to vote on them separately obviously so...

Commissioner Hartnett: Right. I think it would be easier. I agree with what was said about, previously I hadn't really cared that much about the demo. But what I really appreciate Madam Chair is reiterating the rules by which we're supposed to be deciding these. And you know there are two criteria for demolition. Its unsafe or no alternatives to demolition. I don't think in general when it comes to the second, when we're talking about the tall building yeah of course you gotta demolish it. But I think there are alternatives to demolishing it. At least I don't think we have explored sufficiently the alternatives to demolition for these buildings. I think there may be some uses for these buildings within the district that are separate from that. So given the fact that we have met either of those I would tend to feel like that I probably wouldn't support that certificate of appropriateness.

Commissioner Faucher: Commissioner Lackovic.

Commissioner Lackovic: First of all I think your summary, Commissioner Hunter Weir is exactly kind of parallels exactly what I've been thinking and probably going to reiterate a little bit of that. But first of all I just want to thank staff for the thought that went into the analysis for the historic building. I think that was very helpful. And I came to slightly different conclusions. But still I think there were a lot of important pieces that were brought out in that staff report. But where I differ a little bit, you know, this was a unique, the strangeness, the architectural style. It is unique for this district. But the unique doesn't necessarily mean that it is insignificant. And there's a lot of debate about whether or not it is significant just because it just flat out doesn't fit in with anything anybody's seen in the area. But that doesn't necessarily exclude it. Because it comes by it's, you know, we're asking these questions because it has legitimate authenticity and integrity. It's got great integrity but it has authenticity. It was constructed during the period of significance for the district. I'd also say past losses don't justify additional loss here; so the degradation of, or the loss of other historic buildings on that block and adjacent blocks doesn't justify this one coming down either. And I think really what is important for me is scrubbing a historic district to eliminate buildings that do not conform to the general type, that in and of itself creates a false sense of history. So I would say, just because this one doesn't fit in, eliminating it is not necessarily the right thing to do because it is there legitimately. So these are the things that I was wrangling with a little bit. I agree, when you first look at it you think well that's, what a strange thing. Why is it here? And really will we miss it when it's gone? And that kind of takes me down a different path. I think the context for this neighborhood, what's important about the context of the water power district, especially this portion of the water power district is that it is that transition zone between the higher, higher elevations for the grain elevators and the low scale residential. This was the transition zone. So the fact that this weird little building exist actually in my opinion supports what that transition zone was about. It transition in height. It transitioned in use. And so for those reasons I would say this is actually a contributing building; because of those reasons and the fact that they were able to make it work, maybe not successful, but for 44 years, again a legitimate contributor to the neighborhood. But taking a step back now and just looking at the water power district that we've come to recognize and champion. Would the loss of this building impact the overall integrity, feel or context for the water power district? And I would have to say no. So I think it is a legitimate contributing building. Would its loss alter the way we interpret or feel about the water power district maybe

not? But I still think it's definitely, it's not an easy decision because it definitely has its place. These are kind of my struggles for the day.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Vork.

Commissioner Vork: Thank you. I just want to make a couple of comments on the no reasonable alternatives part that we've talked about before and perhaps I've talked about several times. I struggle with the notion that one building moving company can illustrate to us that there is no way to move a building. And what I really want to know is who's been made aware of the opportunity to reuse this building. And that's a rhetorical question. But I think I know we're only talking about A, I'm going to have a challenge with approving A for that reason. I don't see that there are no reasonable alternatives. But I would like to hear what others have to say to convince me because I'm having a challenge with it.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Lackovic.

Commissioner Lackovic: I think that again we've?? the degree of integrity that it's not dangerous that eliminates that first one. I think Sue you hit it right on the head; it comes down to the economic value of this building. That's what we're actually talking about here, the buy-ability, economic value of that site. And given the developmental, the development pressures on that neighborhood and all of our neighborhoods, I think it would be difficult to make the case to keep the building. Because of the, because of its style, because of its position on the site I think that the economic value probably is not there. And so in that sense I can see the argument for that. You know that new construction, tall construction you know obviously if you take a building that's that big and replace it with something larger you're going to change the, you're going to have tremendous impact on the tax base and the people in the neighborhood. So I think the argument can be made for that. And that's the argument that has to be made. Is it the right decision though? Is it the right way to go? What do we gain and what do we lose? And that's what it always comes down to. And on this one I would have to say, being the devil's advocate here, that because it is, although I would argue it has significance, it's the level of significance for this area is probably less than, if this was a mill, if this was the elevator, if this was something that really had a much more powerful compelling story for the water power district, we would probably be having a very different discussion. But as a stand-alone building, it kind of has its own little history. Let's say that it's probably going to be one of the first ones to be moved out to make, for overall progress for the City. So I think you can make the argument and I think if given the arguable level of significance of this contributing building that might be, that might just tip the balance. It had a much more significant, if it was a much more significant historic, it had more historic value on a national level, even in that district then I think you could spin it the other way.

Chair Faucher: I think you have to recall its purpose as far as its social history though too and how it was related to the mills.

Commissioner Lackovic: I understand that. But again it comes down to the overall; again, I'm not saying that. It's still significant; I'm just saying that its level, it doesn't probably compete with the A Mill as far as....

Chair Faucher: Well no, that's a national landmark.

Commissioner Lackovic: That's my point. So in the scheme of significance this one may be a little lower down.

Chair Faucher: Ok. Commissioner Stade.

Commissioner Stade: I wanted to talk about the historical significance. The A Mill shows the apex of St. Anthony as a city, an economic district. This building shows the economic history of the diminishment of the area, as well as the Pillsbury Library does. They're both after the boom. Eastsiders, east Minneapolis folks, the St. Anthony people that were part of the merger in the 1870s would say that by law a merger but they had their unique identity. But their economic status diminished and the history of this Commercial Club shows how that decline happened. And I would argue that's why it's historically important.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Mack.

Commissioner Mack: Well I confess to a bit of confusion because as I understand it the rules or the tests, is there another use for it or is it dangerous apply if it's a historic building right? And I guess I am agreeing with staff that I find these buildings not contributing to the historic district of the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. And in fact I find thinking that they are diminishes what that district is about. I mean it is so much more about the history of the river and its growth and development and the falls itself. And these are kind of outliers, particularly the Athletic Club and so I don't understand why we would have to have a test that they can only be demolished if they cannot be reused or they are dangerous.

Chair Faucher: A certificate of appropriateness is required to allow the proposed demolition of the structures. Maybe staff can answer that question a little more thoroughly.

Staff Widmeier: Maybe just to summarize, just for any property located in an historic district and they are proposing to demolish it, we still need to address those findings. So even the Athletic Club that was constructed in 1966 we have to address those demolition findings.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Vork did you have something further? Commissioner Bengtson.

Commissioner Bengtson: I guess I agree with the fact that this building isn't really necessarily contributing to the district significantly. And I also feel that considering the significance that is being argued is for the Commercial Club that retaining the Commercial Clubs building to stop further development of that site seems to be kind of contradictory towards that social history.

Chair Faucher: Could you expand on that a little bit?

Commissioner Bengtson: It's a building that's supposed to be memorializing the Commercial Club of St. Anthony and I believe that in their hay day they would have sold that building off in a second and moved somewhere else if someone wanted to build on that site. So commemorating that in its location and holding it fast there to me it kind of betrays that social history that's attached to it in a way, in a way.

Chair Faucher: We can't really speculate on....Commissioner Mack.

Commissioners Mack: I was just going to make a motion to move things along. It might not do that and there may be more discussion.

Chair Faucher: Oh Commissioner Vork.

Commissioner Vork: I just want to clarify one thing about the comments that I made before. I don't oppose the project. What's troubling me here is the destruction of the building that is interesting, potentially important, otherwise serviceable and so what I would hope for in the future I guess is to see more effort taken to be collaborative and open with anybody that might have interest in reusing the structure in some way incorporating it in some other site or in some other fashion. So I don't know who was made aware of the availability or potential future availability of this building but that's kind of what I was getting at. Not opposition to the ultimate project. Hopefully that makes sense.

Chair Faucher: Ok. Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: I think I'm in agreement with Commissioner Vork on this. My concern is not with the proposed new building as much as the statement we're making about the historic district. Or that I feel we would be making. And that is, we do have guidelines. We are basically bound to uphold them. Not to say that yeah you can't make an exception. But I was trying to get a perspective on what a 40 story building looks like, cause I'm not real good at this kind of thing. And that's eight stories taller than the Foshay Tower. Imagine that, that's huge. And in that context, you know, the other buildings, the tall buildings are really not very tall. But I really am concerned that we did have a process, that there were guidelines that we have things that say, I mean talk about safety and all these other things. And that we are really setting a precedent here. How do you tell the next person that comes along that these guidelines have any meaning? So that's my bind. And it is not a criticism of the proposed building as such.

Chair Faucher: Are you referring more to the demolition or to the new?

Commissioner Hunter Weir: These things are so inextricably linked that it's very hard. I mean the question became what if it was just a matter of knocking down the building, with no plan for anything to be there. How would this fall out? I don't think we can even imagine that at this point. There is emotive, there is something that is pushing this forward that we really can't, you know, it's what you call an 800 pound gorilla sitting behind us, you know, it's there. But I think that if you look at the demolition just strictly from the point of demolition and not from the new development. It really feels to me like our charge is pretty clearly defined.

Chair Faucher: Well there have been a couple of past studies that identified the building as potentially eligible. On it's on aside from being contributing to the district. Commissioner Hartnett.

Commissioner Hartnett: I kind of like to make a motion. I move to deny the certificate of appropriateness to allow for the demolition of the two buildings in the St. Anthony Falls Historic District.

Chair Faucher: If we do that, I also meant to remind everyone that we can't leave it at that we have to also then direct the planning director to prepare or cause to be prepared a designation study and nominating it for historic designation. That's a requirement. Is there a second?

Commissioner Hunter Weir: I'll second.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Hunter Weir. Any further discussion? Commissioner Stade.

Commissioner Stade: Just a clarifying question. Why would it need a historic study if it's already a part of a district?

Chair Faucher: Perhaps Ms. Dvorak could answer that for us. I don't think it's identified specifically as a contributing building in the district, but it's not identified as not contributing.

Staff Dvorak: Because it is in an historic district and it's not the demolition of historic resource you would not have to do the designation study. You are just saying it is contributing building and therefore historic and denying the demolition.

Chair Faucher: Oh ok. Sorry, I was confused about that. Would you....

Commissioner Hartnett: Yeah I think we should request that it be uh, give me the verbiage.

Chair Faucher: That we should direct the planning director to prepare or cause to be prepared a designation study.

Commissioner Harnett: Thank you.

Chair Faucher: Is the seconder ok with that? Ok. She said we don't have to but we can is what I'm understanding.

Staff Dvorak: Give me a minute I want to make sure that.....

Chair Faucher: In the meantime, Commissioner Mack did you have something to...

Commissioner Mack: Couldn't we just find that it is a contributing building and therefore we deny the demolition.

Chair Faucher: I think that's what we're waiting for to clarify. I think that might be an option. I think in the past we haven't had potentially contributing to a district building, it's always been like a stand-alone building that wasn't...yeah, at least that I can recall.

Staff Dvorak: And this is just a quick review of the ordinance. And I would ask Janelle to chime in if she's reading anything differently. But, it only talks about directing the planning director to commence a designation study when the property is not in an historic district and whether you're trying to decide if it's a potential historic resource or not. It is because it's in the district. And so I think by denying it you are saying it's a contributing building to the district. And there's no need to do a designation study to assert that fact.

Chair Faucher: Alright.

Commissioner Hartnett: Are we increasing its protection by designating it, by having a designation study done on that? I think that's the question.

Staff Dvorak: To determine if a property should be a landmark, that research is done. The research has been done tonight. So what you're saying is you disagree with the research that's been done for x, y and z reasons. Which you'll need to state why you're denying, you know, notwithstanding staff recommendation you're denying the certificate of appropriateness. To deny it you're going to be stating the significance of the building on its own. I can't say definitively tonight, I would want to consult with our City Attorney as to whether you can or cannot. Our certificate of appropriateness section in our ordinance talks about mitigation plans when....

Commissioner Hartnett: Well maybe we should separate those at this point then. And if we, one of decides that we want to ask a designation study be prepared that we bring that up at another time, that at this point that we just drop that portion of the motion.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: Isn't the fact that it's in a historic district more or less interim protection? It's not even interim, it's protected.

Commissioner Hartnett: I think that's true. I think that supports just striking that portion of the motion.

Chair Faucher: Ok. But...go ahead Commissioner Lackovic.

Commissioner Lackovic: Staff treated the 1929 portion of the building as a contributing building. The later addition and the Athletic Club were clearly outside of the period of significance so those were the easy ones. But in the report it was acknowledged and treated as a contributing building. So we've already established that. I mean I think that's actually, I think she did a good job of creating, showing how it fits in and what its relative place in history was. So I don't know that a designation study would get us, I mean it would get us a little bit more but I think we'd be having the same conversation. And I don't know that the end result would be a whole lot different. And you know we can protect the building, we can offer it; try to do interim protection and that sort of thing. But I think in this case, it's going to be a difficult site to defend given the development pressures. So I guess my question is are we not better off trying to be more proactive for what happens there given the fact that this might be kind of low hanging fruit.

Commissioner Hartnett: I think that's the very reason why we exist is to push against the economic pressures and to try to protect and preserve the historic districts. So I would like to keep the motion...again, let me back up, let me just say, I recommend that we deny the certificate of appropriateness to allow the demolition of the two buildings in the St. Anthony Falls Historic District and only that portion of the motion, and to strike any request or any recommendation for designation study.

Chair Faucher: Is that acceptable to the seconder? Yes. Ok. Are we, I'm just wondering if, Hilary, we are ok with going on that or not?

Staff Dvorak: To deny the certificate of appropriateness yes.

Chair Faucher: Just as we worded it? Ok. Any further discussion or should we just, the clerk can call the roll? You can call the roll.

Absent: Olson

Aye: Faucher, Hartnett, Hunter Weir, Vork,

Nay: Bengtson, Lackovic, Mack, Stade

Motion failed

Chair Faucher: We have a tie. We have one absence and we are down one commissioner. Should I just withdraw my vote?

Staff Dvorak: If you so choose to.

Chair Faucher: I don't choose to. Alright then we need to have another motion don't we? Does anyone else have any other ideas for another motion?

Commissioner Stade: Another motion?

Chair Faucher: Yes, that would be something different that might...

Commissioner Stade: I move to approve the certificate of appropriateness as it is written in our agenda here.

Chair Faucher: For the demolition, the first one.

Commissioner Stade: For the demolition, A, yes.

Chair Faucher: Is there a second?

Commissioner Bengtson: Second.

Chair Faucher: Thank you Commissioner Bengtson, any further discussion? Hilary.

Staff Dvorak: I just want to note that there are three conditions of approval attached to the staff recommendation. And the first one does talk about recordation of the property and the other two are standard conditions. I just wanted to note that if that is what the motioner intended.

Commissioner Stade: I said as written, as it is written in the agenda.

Chair Faucher: Alright thank you. Will the clerk call the roll?

Absent: Olson

Aye: Bengtson, Lackovic, Mack, Stade

Nay: Faucher, Hartnett, Hunter Weir, Vork

Motion failed

Chair Faucher: Well this is an interesting conundrum. So.

Commissioner Lackovic: Here's another thought. Again it just comes down to the relative significance within the district, again, fully acknowledging that the building has its own history and an important place in our heritage culture. If we, and this is a question, if we expand on the mitigation as conditioned in point number one. If we expand on that, right now it's just a photographic survey, if we expand on it to, this is where I'm relying on my friends down here at the end, to include more of the social history, to do more than just photographic and put it in a drawer. What could we do to make the mitigation more meaningful and have that be really contributing piece to Minnesota history, to Minneapolis history.

Chair Faucher: There was a proposal, or, Mr. Motzenbecker talked about the app for one thing.

Commissioner Lackovic: Just in terms of the general history of the social club and how it fits into this district. We should get something more than photographs that go out in drawer. Is it a series of

articles, is it you know, some kind of...we should be digging deeper and getting out the history of these important pieces before we lose them and I don't know, is that a plaque similar to what we did, to what the grassroots efforts down in the North Loop for the strike. You know, what, does anyone have any thoughts or ideas? Will that even help us get thought the deadlock?

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Hartnett I think I'm going to go with you first because I think this is more towards the people that are voting against demolition.

Commissioner Hartnett: Yeah I guess I have two thoughts on that. I think that probably the most largest significance of this building is the social history and the group, the Commercial Club, so I think that will help. But I think my real concern is, I just don't think by the guidelines and by the rules we have, I don't think we have met either of the two criteria. I don't think that it's unsafe and I don't think that alternatives to demolition have been sufficiently explored. And until we do those things I don't think we're in a position to demolish it.

Chair Faucher: Ms. Widmeier did you have something to add?

Staff Widmeier: Thank you Chair Faucher, the applicant just noted to me, if additional mitigation factors were considered they would offer up making the building available for someone to move and relocate to reuse at another location for six months. So that is something that you could, if you chose to add that in, that's an idea.

Chair Faucher: Ok thank you. Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: I've think I've gone off on this rant before. I'm not a fan of mitigation. You know what the heck, a kiosk, pictures, things that people are not going to look at. To me it's always just kind of splitting the difference. You know, we've been offered this or I've been offered this on a number of properties. It's like oh, we'll give you pictures, we'll give you a little plaque or whatever. It's not the same as the building. And frankly, I can't think of something that would be a substitute. And I don't mean to be snarky about it but, you know, if you're going to do it, do it with conviction. But we've seen these kiosks all over the place and I can't honestly say I've seen anybody ever look at them. So I'm not a fan.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Mack.

Commissioner Mack: Well once again I think we have to look at this building and think about how important it is. And to me, it is not significant part of the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. And honestly, the block as it now stands is not a great contribution to the City. Just apart from what's going to happen as an issue or not, I do not think that the St. Anthony Commercial Club and the St. Anthony Athletic Club are worth preserving.

Chair Faucher: Commissioner Vork.

Commissioner Vork: I would be willing to support this motion if there was some provision for the building being made available for a period of time like six months and in some fashion where the opportunity could be widely shared, like through a website page or something, so that every opportunity was sought to reuse this building. Like I think I said before, to me it's not so important that the building be on the site. But that it not be wasted into rubble.

Chair Faucher: Is that a motion?

Commissioner Vork: I supposed it could be ok. So, make a fourth condition? Is that on the developer?

Chair Faucher: That's what they volunteered so yes.

Commissioner Vork: So, condition number four, the developer will make the building available, the Commercial Club building available...

Chair Faucher: Would you just read the, let's just read this whole thing one more time and then we can put this thing to bed. You don't have to read two and three but what the recommended motion is so everyone is...

Commissioner Vork: I'll make a motion to approve the certificate of appropriateness to allow the demolition of two buildings in the St. Anthony Falls Historic District subject to the following conditions, suggesting that condition number one may be expanded to include as mitigation, would we insert after, demolition of the St. Anthony Commercial Club building, the developer will make the structure available. Pardon?

Commissioner Lackovic: <inaudible> it should be more than a photographic recordation.

Chair Faucher: She's proposing something different.

Commissioner Vork: I'm proposing that the Commercial Club building be made available in a widely public way for relocation, reuse in whole or in part to whoever might...

Chair Faucher: I think that should be a separate line item from item number one. Because I think they are very much two different things.

Commissioner Vork: Ok, so condition number four, the developer will make the Commercial Club building widely available through a website or other means for a period of six months, available to anyone who is interested in removing it from the site in whole or in part and reusing. Yes, please reuse it once you remove it.

Commissioner Hartnett: Second.

Chair Faucher: Alright thank you. Any further discussion? Will the clerk call the roll on that one?

Absent: Olson

Aye: Bengtson, Hartnett, Lackovic, Mack, Stade, Vork

Nay: Hunter Weir

Abstain: Faucher

Motion passed

Chair Faucher: Before we continue on to the next one we'll have a ten minute recess. We'll reconvene at 8:10.

Recording stopped here. Upon return from break after discussion, Commissioner Mack made a motion that resulted in the following action:

Action: Notwithstanding staff findings, the Heritage Preservation Commission **denied** the certificate of appropriateness to allow a new 40-story building, based on the following findings:

1. The building would not be compatible with the adopted guidelines.
2. The scale and height is not consistent with the guidelines.
3. The building is not compatible with the historic district.
4. The setbacks to the adjacent contributing property are deficient.
5. A taller building detracts from the historic structures.
6. Impact to natural environment also needs to be considered e.g. Mississippi River flyway for birds.

Only one vote was taken as the motion passed as follows:

Absent: Olson

Aye: Bengtson, Faucher, Hartnett, Hunter Weir, Lackovic, Mack

Nay: Stade, Vork

Item #6

200 Central Avenue Southeast and 113 2nd Street Southeast, Ward 3

Staff report by [Janelle Widmeier](#), BZH 29057 and BZH 29058

This item was continued from the April 05, 2016, HPC meeting.

The Department of Community Planning and Economic Development recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission adopt staff findings for the applications by Alatus, LLC for the properties located at 200 Central Avenue Southeast and 113 2nd Street Southeast in the St. Anthony Falls Historic District:

A. Certificate of Appropriateness.

Action: The Heritage Preservation Commission **approved** the certificate of appropriateness to allow the demolition of two buildings in the Saint Anthony Falls Historic District, subject to the following conditions:

1. As mitigation for the demolition of the Saint Anthony Commercial Club building, a photographic recordation of the property shall be prepared and submitted to staff that is in accordance with the guidelines of the Minnesota Historic Property Record.
2. The developer will make the Commercial Club building widely available (through a website or other means) for a period of six months to allow the options of relocation for reuse to be explored.
3. By ordinance, approvals are valid for a period of two years from the date of the decision unless required permits are obtained and the action approved is substantially begun and proceeds in a continuous basis toward completion. Upon written request and for good cause, the planning director may grant up to a one year extension if the request is made in writing no later than May 3, 2018.
4. By ordinance, all approvals granted in this certificate of appropriateness shall remain in effect as long as all of the conditions and guarantees of such approvals are observed. Failure to comply with such conditions and guarantees shall constitute a violation of this Certificate of Appropriateness and may result in termination of the approval.

Absent: Olson

Aye: Bengtson, Hartnett, Lackovic, Mack, Stade, Vork

Nay: Hunter Weir

Abstain: Faucher

Motion passed

B. Certificate of Appropriateness.

Action: Notwithstanding staff findings, the Heritage Preservation Commission **denied** the certificate of appropriateness to allow a new 40-story building, based on the following findings:

7. The building would not be compatible with the adopted guidelines.
8. The scale and height is not consistent with the guidelines.
9. The building is not compatible with the historic district.
10. The setbacks to the adjacent contributing property are deficient.
11. A taller building detracts from the historic structures.
12. Impact to natural environment also needs to be considered e.g. Mississippi River flyway for birds.

Absent: Olson

Aye: Bengtson, Faucher, Hartnett, Hunter Weir, Lackovic, Mack

Nay: Stade, Vork

Motion passed