

Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission  
June 5, 2007  
Minutes

520 2<sup>nd</sup> Street SE, St. Anthony Falls Historic District, Ward 3 (Staff: [Erik Carlson](#)) Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a 10 story condominium building.

Chair Koski: Commissioners are there somebody who's entertaining a motion? Commissioner Anderson I see you're making some notes. Not to put you on the spot.

Commissioner Anderson: I have no problem with the height anymore. I think the primary façade question is, I don't have a problem with that either. Now that the railroad lines are gone, I think this pathway is the best we can hope for, for representing the outlines. But I'd like one of the architects to talk a little bit more about the concrete and the glass.

Architect: Thank you, Commissioners Anderson. I think the, I'm assuming you're mentioning specifically of the façade on the rear quarter side. And again, I think we had made the attempt to submit this information after that last, this current façade here at the last meeting which is what the model does represent which is our attention of the project because of the sort of staff findings. This was the end of April. So, the intent here again is to recreate that on those lower levels as primarily a brick façade. It doesn't have glass in the openings. It's obviously open because there are cars behind there, but developed in a way that was more sympathetic with the rest of the brick structures in the area. Also emanating from a pattern that derived on the primary façade on Second Street to make that a little less foreboding, a little more interesting and also to treat these building -- these currently so these are not -- these are brick, panelized brick façade and while I think its referential to the area it does also talk in a current architectural vocabulary on the area. Thanks.

Chair Koski: If I might respond to your comments Commissioner Anderson -- I am also a little bit troubled by the so called rear elevation and I guess the calculation that the adjoining proposed development has an 11 foot setback and here they're only asking for seven is that correct? For a total of 18, so why not 11, why not the 15 feet as required? I'm worried that by approving something that would be less in the required setback according to Zoning they would actually receive a historic variance which I don't think is justified. I'm also

concerned that we see a design which has a base. I'm much more interested in the later development but we can only approve or deny the proposal that is in front of us that's been submitted and vested by staff. So even though other designs may be interesting we are not going to design on the fly here this evening. We are only going to review what staff has approved or what staff has reviewed. I also am not too concerned about the height of the structure given the proposed height of the Pillsbury A Mill Complex. Does that seem to fall in line with your thinking Commissioner Anderson?

Commissioner Anderson: Obtained in what you think about your calling the primary façade, you're saying why not back it up so we have a complete corridor?

Chair Koski: Well, I think, let's talk about that a little more to compare it to the other developments -- isn't necessarily fair because that's basically a cleared out area. Certainly there were rail lines at some point but there weren't a lot of structures that relates to it, certainly no X'd in structures. Here we have neighbors that are cheek by jowel, sitting flanking this property. So there is a direct relationship and those are both historic properties contributing assets in the historic districts. So there is a relationship and because they both have similar setbacks from the rear, I think there is kind of a defined massing historically that should be respected. I also personally agree with some of the City actions that preserve the visual corridor along the historic railway. So even though I am concerned that it won't be necessarily public or truly public because I think it perhaps would benefit the City if it were but you could at least appreciate that view shared when you're on the sidewalk, when you're moving through and around this urban district. You would still get those sight lines which we do appreciate today.

Commissioner Anderson: That makes sense to me whether we call it the primary façade or what – that's not the issue here.

Chair Koski: Right and I don't think we should necessarily be using zoning terminology when dealing with preservation issues. Did you want to make a motion Commissioner Anderson? Please.

Commissioner Anderson: HARD TO HEAR

Jack Byers: Sorry, we couldn't hear that?

Chair Koski: Could you repeat that Commissioner Anderson? I don't think that it made into the microphone.

Commissioner Anderson: I'm going to make a motion that we adopt some of the staff findings and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed with conditions and that's where I need some help. The first finding, of course, is a given, how do we deal with number 2? It's a kind of a dead issue now isn't it?

Chair Koski: Personally, I'm inclined not to, well; you haven't completed the motion so I'm sorry.

Commissioner Anderson: Okay, well, I don't know how to deal with number 2. I move that we take out the words "primary façade" and a setback.

Chair Koski: Is that item number 3 or number 2?

Commissioner Anderson: Item number 3 -- that we're going to eliminate the words "primary façade" and ask for a setback to comply with the existing site lines but I need some help in working that out. And number 4, I'm going to leave that alone, number 5 now this is the rear (south) wall, is that the one that you have concerns about Chairman Koski?

Chair Koski: The only thing with item, finding number 5 is I would remove the second sentence because I don't know how germane it is.

Commissioner Anderson: The second sentence being: The proposed structure does not meet.

Chair Koski: The HPC approvals because it makes it sound like the previous approval was a guideline which it isn't.

Commissioner Anderson: Tell me, number 6, how does, what is a clear directional emphasis in this case?

Chair Koski: I think that was satisfied with the organization of the windows and the openings.

Commissioner Anderson: So, we're going to eliminate that.

Chair Koski: No, I think it is acceptable.

Commissioner Anderson: Well, I mean we'll keep it in.

Chair Koski: Because it says that the design meets the district guidelines.

Commissioner Anderson: But there's no discussion. How about the brick? I think that's okay as far as I'm concerned. Now, but, you're going to argue against me. So, I would.

Chair Koski: Well, Commissioner Anderson, I would just recommend that perhaps that you modify what you feel comfortable with and then we'll make final amendments as needed.

Commissioner Anderson: You can tell that I'm a little, I'm not an architect and I'm a little leery of recommending denial of the window openings and the pre-cast panels. So, I need some help from the architects, do you think that this, or are we not going to get into designing the building?

Chair Koski: Are you complete with your motion?

Commissioner Anderson: Well, wait a minute.

Chair Koski: Before we get into a discussion I want to make sure that you've made a motion and that it's seconded and we can discuss it.

Commissioner Anderson: I made a motion, okay, but I don't know how to deal with number 2.

Chair Koski: Okay, I will let that stand and then ask somebody to offer a friendly amendment.

Commissioner Anderson: Okay, and I will do the same with the other -- 7, 8, 9 and 10; has the stability answered to -- it has to my approval -- so, I'm going to eliminate 11. Okay?

Chair Koski: Okay, you're eliminating number 11. Your motion eliminates number 11.

Commissioner Anderson: To eliminate it.

Chair Koski: Okay.

Commissioner Anderson: So, we're going to keep finding 1, I'm going to ask for help on 2, and three we're going to eliminate primary façade and I'm going to need help on that too. Number 4 – that's going to be okay, number 5 – we're going to take out the last sentence; number 6 – we're going to leave and now I'm going to ask for help on 7, 8, 9 and 10.

Chair Koski: Alright is that your motion?

Commissioner Anderson: That's my motion.

Chair Koski: Is there a second to the motion? Okay that's been seconded. Discussion?

Chair Koski: Commissioner Crippen?

Commissioner Crippen: Just maybe to help me understand it, to try to just still down the various concerns and questions here and maybe Commissioner Anderson can tell me if she agrees, are we down to two issues? That we, as I understand it we're down to two issues – there's the setback on the rear corridor side and there's the proportion of glass versus brick. Beyond that, accept for those two issues you would approve this Certificate of Appropriateness and your hoping in this, your motion that the approval would have conditions that those two factors are – that they would be changed?

Commissioner Anderson: Without doing actual design, yes, a modification.

Commissioner Crippen: So we could issue a Certificate of Appropriateness saying we need for them to come back with refined designs on those two issues, is that fair to say? I don't know how that works with a motion; I mean I do think that the findings are a little muddled here. Because there's various irrelevancies as we mix things matching – district guidelines versus matching previous actions of the HPC and the Planning Commission. So, I don't know how much we have to concern ourselves with.

Commissioner Anderson: Well, I don't either because I don't want to design the building – I certainly can't design the building. But I am not really happy with the way it fits the neighborhood. But basically you're right Commissioner Crippen.

Chair Koski: Commissioner Lee

Commissioner Lee: We cannot review the new changes, correct? So we're looking at what is in our packets. I guess having said that it's maybe, it's a no brainer that this has to come back and we need to let our conditions stand and I know that's a lot closer to where we're going. I think it's a lot closer. The rail corridor is my biggest concern right now – I think the brick given the new design but we can't look at that -- is getting a lot closer, the windows worked a little bit better for me. The rail corridor façade of the parking ramp is better in that one too. But we can't review that so I think we need to leave it as it is.

Jack Byers: Mr. Chair and Commissioners I liked to confirm for the record that the point of the public hearing is so that the applicant and any interested parties can bring forward whatever information they think is important for the commission. So, you are able to deal with new information that's been presented to you. Staff has not reviewed that information, we've reviewed the application that was submitted but the point of the hearing is so that new information can come forward either from the applicant or any other interested party, i.e., neighbors, neighborhood groups, so on. So you are able to deal with new information if you so choose.

Chair Koski: Commissioner Crippen.

Commissioner Crippen: Just to clarify Mr. Byers, how do we if there is a design element that's been presented tonight, how do we properly get that into a record or into a finding so that it's the officially approved designed element as opposed to what was in the packet, do we just create a finding?

Jack Byers: Mr. Chair and Commissioner Crippen, it is up to the commission to use the information from the hearing to balance and make your decision, you can choose to incorporate it or not incorporate it – that's the point of the hearing.

Chair Koski: I'm sorry; we've closed the public hearing. I'm really concerned about anytime that we do more than changing a window minion here or there on a project, especially doing something as drastic as saying we like your design but shave off 20 feet on the back of your building. It ends up with a completely different design. I think also saying rather than the original application, let's just take a look at something that's on the overhead projector and approve that. I'm really nervous about doing that and we have done that historically in the past, not a lot, not frequently and not successfully. So, I would

discourage us from going in that direction. I personally think that for one thing I can't support the motion that's before us. I appreciate Commissioner Anderson for sticking her neck out there. But I just think that there is just too much that needs further design thought and consideration and the straightest path to get there is to deny this application and have them redesign it and come back. So I'm going to call a vote on the motion before us to adopt staff findings with a couple of changes and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chair Koski: All in favor say "Aye"; all opposed say "Nay" (Nay, Nay) Abstained. Do you want to abstain on your on vote?

Commissioner Anderson: I'll abstain.

Chair Koski: So, that fails. I'm going to move that we adopt staff findings and deny the Certificate of Appropriateness. I'm going to modify the findings; however, eliminating finding number 5, Number 11, I'm sorry. I'm going to eliminate finding number 5 entirely. And that's my motion.

Commissioner Anderson: What about 2 and 3?

Chair Koski: I'm content to let them stand. Alright is there any discussion? So the motion before is to adopt staff findings except number 5 and number 11 and to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness. All in favor say "Aye"; Aye, Aye, Aye; Opposed? No. One "no", abstentions? **The motion carries and the C of A is denied.** I'm sure you're aware that there is an appeal process that you may apply for. Thank you.