



Request for City Council Committee Action from the Department of Community Planning & Economic Development – Planning Division

Date: August 23, 2007

To: Council Member Gary Schiff, Chair, Zoning and Planning Committee
Members of the Committee

Referral to: Zoning and Planning Committee

Subject: Appeal of the Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) action denying an application for the demolition of an historic resource to allow for the demolition of a structure at 1724 Colfax Avenue South by Todd M. Hess and William L. Tricker.

Recommendation: The HPC, notwithstanding staff recommendation, denied an application for the Demolition of a Historic Resource on July 24, 2007 to allow for the demolition of residential structure located at 1724 Colfax Avenue South.

Previous Directives: N/A

Prepared or Submitted by: Brian Schaffer, City Planner, 612-673-2670

Approved by: Jack Byers, Planning Supervisor, 612-673-2634

Presenters in Committee: Brian Schaffer, City Planner

Financial Impact (Check those that apply)

- No financial impact (If checked, go directly to Background/Supporting Information).
- Action requires an appropriation increase to the _____ Capital Budget or _____ Operating Budget.
- Action provides increased revenue for appropriation increase.
- Action requires use of contingency or reserves.
- Business Plan: _____ Action is within the plan. _____ Action requires a change to plan.
- Other financial impact (Explain):
- Request provided to department's finance contact when provided to the Committee Coordinator.

Community Impact (use any categories that apply)

Ward: 7

Neighborhood Notification: Lowry Hill Residents, Inc. was notified of the appeal on August 13, 2007.

City Goals: See staff report.

Comprehensive Plan: See staff report.

Zoning Code: See staff report.

Living Wage/Job Linkage: Not applicable.

End of 60/120-day Decision Period: Not applicable.

Other: Not applicable.

Background/Supporting Information Attached: On July 24, 2007 the HPC voted 5-1 to deny an application for the Demolition of a Potential Historic Resource to allow for the demolition of a residential structure located at 1724 Colfax Avenue South.

The appellant filed and appeal on August 3, 2007. The appellant's statement is included in the attached supporting material.

In a 2006 historic survey of the Calhoun-Isles Area, 1724 Colfax Avenue South was identified as a contributing property to a proposed historic district called the Groveland Addition Historic District. The survey recommended the property for "intensive level survey and research as part of a distinctive area of residential development within the Groveland Addition."

Supporting Material

July 24, 2007 HPC Actions

Appellant Statement of Appeal

Meeting Minutes

July 24, 2007 HPC Staff Report with attachments

Correspondence received from citizens regarding the demolition on or before July 24, 2007

Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission

2007 HPC Actions

Regular Meeting

July 24, 2007

4:30 p.m. - Room 317, [City Hall](#), Minneapolis, Minnesota

Commissioners: Chair Koski, Anderson, Crippen, Larsen, Messenger, and Ollendorf.

Excused Absences: Commissioner Dunn and Selchow.

Committee Clerk: Dan Villarreal (612) 673-2615

Call to order

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes

MOTION by Commissioner Larsen to **APPROVE** minutes. **SECOND** by Commissioner Ollendorf.
MOTION APPROVED with one abstention.

Public Hearings

Introduction to the Public Hearing

Public Hearing

1. 2001 University Avenue SE, Fire Station 19, Ward 2 (Staff: Molly McCartney)

Certificate of Appropriateness for building addition

Action

Motion by Commissioner Anderson to **adopt** staff findings with conditions 1-3. **Seconded** by Commissioner Messenger. **Approved** with one abstention.

2. 1724 Colfax Avenue South, John Speedy House, Ward 7 (Staff: Brian Schaffer) Demolition of a Historic Resource

Action

Motion by Commissioner Messenger to **adopt** staff findings and **deny** Demolition of a Historic Resource. **Seconded** by Commissioner Larsen with modifications: Finding number 4 four to read. "The John Speedy House was recommended for intensive level survey and research as part of a distinctive area of residential development within the Groveland Addition." Finding number 1 to be amended to read "The house was built in 1885 as evidenced by the building permit card and the original owner was John Speedy a paint and wallpaper dealer in early Minneapolis." Commission invokes interim protection as per the City's preservation Ordinance. **Motion** carries with one NAY.

3. **724 East 26th Street, Children's Hospitals and Clinics Ward 6 (Staff: Aaron Hanauer)**

Demolition of a Historic Resource

Action

Motion by Commissioner Lee to **adopt** staff findings and continue the application to the August 21, 2007 meeting. **Seconded** by Commissioner Crippen. **Motion to continue** the application for Demolition of a Historic Resource to the regularly scheduled meeting of the Heritage Preservation Commission on August 21, 2007..

Information/Discussion Items

4. Archeological Data Recovery for the **Whitney Hotel** (Former Standard Mill) Renovation Project, Anne Ketz, 106 Group. Informational item, final report presentation as requested by HPC on April 11, 2006 (Staff: Carol Ahlgren) – continued from July 10, 2007 meeting. Informational presentation. No action required by HPC.
5. Update on the **Minnesota Ballpark Project** from Hennepin County staff (Jack Byers) Informational presentation. No action required by HPC.

Commission Business

Adjournment

No meeting of the Heritage Preservation Commission on August 7, 2007

Next Regular Heritage Preservation Commission Meeting: August 21, 2007

The Chair reserves the right to limit discussion on Agenda items.

Heritage Preservation Commission decisions are final unless appealed.

Attention: If you want help translating this information, call **-Hmong** - Ceeb toom. Yog koj xav tau kev pab txhais cov xov no rau koj dawb, hu 612-673-2800; **Spanish** - Atención. Si desea recibir asistencia gratuita para traducir esta información, llama 612-673-2700; **Somali** - Ogow. Haddii aad dooneyso in lagaa kaalmeeyo tarjamadda macluumaadkani oo lacag la' aan wac 612-673-3500

The meeting site is wheelchair accessible; if you need other disability related accommodations, such as a sign language interpreter or materials in alternative format please contact Dan Villarreal at 612-673-2615.

[Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development \(CPED\) Department Home](#)

Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission

July 24, 2007

Room 317

Staff: Brian Schaffer

Planning Supervisor: Jack Byers

Chair Koski: Item No 2 on our Public Hearing Agenda -- 1724 Colfax Avenue South, staff report by Brian Schaffer. Mr. Schaffer.

Staff Brian Schaffer: Chair Koski and Commissioners, the item before you is a **Demolition of a potential Historic Resource** located at 1724 Colfax Avenue South. This property is known as a John Speedy House. It was built in 1895 and designed by architect Frank Reed. It is a two-story dwelling built as a Queen Anne style with an open front porch and clapboard siding. The porch was likely enclosed in 1901 and the clapboard was covered with stucco and plaster in 1915. As part of that 1915 work a rear two-story sleepy porch was added to this structure.

To give you an idea of the property, the property is located on the corners of Colfax and Douglas highlighted here. The black marking surrounds actually I'll reach that point in a second in my report but its the copies of the potential historic district identified by Mead & Hunt 2006 report. This area is known as the Groveland Addition Residential area and that is this black copy around here and this is 2617 Colfax. Here is a picture which shows that it does border Thomas Lowry Park which is located right here. So this would be a picture facing west looking at the home; Lowry Park, West Side Park and 2617 Colfax heading north. Another picture is this home it's kind of hidden behind some over-grown shrubbery. Again here is part of the home, the porch and a side view along Douglas Avenue. Here is a photo of the porch that was the rear sleepy porch of that in 1915. As you can see there is stucco along the whole line. The only parts original are on the exterior or siding would be the scallops and the gable.

This house was actually originally built as a single-family dwelling but most recently was used as a triplex. In 1946, the building permits were issued to convert the structure into a duplex and at that time they added a rear exterior stair. However, since its operation it has been officially permitted as a duplex but again as it's operated recently as a triplex. This property does have significance as proposed as a historical district and also individually, I quickly speak a little bit towards the significance as identified as part of the district. Again going back to the map there is significance as part of a Potential Historic District, a 2006 Historic Survey Resource Inventory of the Calhoun-Isles area identified this property as contributing property to a proposed historic district called the "Groveland Additional Residential Area". There is a small excerpt of the significance of why this area was identified?

It was actually part of the Groveland Addition created in 1872 and platted on 1872 as part of Thomas Lowry's involvement with Calvin Goodrich. The Groveland Addition was among the earliest sections

of the land near the lakes to be platted and comprised on the western edge of a high-styled residential development in Minneapolis.

The report further really goes on to say that the rapid development of Lowry Hill area did not commence until the 1980's even though this is platted in 1872. The main reason for this was likely the extension of the streetcar lines and actually the Lowry family began really heavily marketing this real estate in 1892 as well.

This area is kind of important because it is known for its large lots, roughly 50 feet by 135 feet at the time. Small blocks are kind of created in a cube-look that you see on some of these blocks here. There are also really interesting deed restrictions which kind of lends toward wealthy residents with restrictions on 25 foot yard setbacks. There is also a minimum construction value of a home of \$5,000. Within the survey there are many other or majority of the construction of this district actually took place between 1893 and 1916. So, that's a little bit about the history of the Groveland Addition Residential Area. I would note that the information submitted by Mead & Hunt about this area also states that many of Minneapolis' leading architects designed structures in this area. Many of the homes featured brick and stone masonry construction or brick veneer just to give you a better design of those homes that they found important in that definition.

Under individual significance, in our records from our inventory forms that are taken place in this inventory format which actually comes from the same survey that was done in 2006 by Mead & Hunt, this information provides us or states that the property does indicate that it meets local designation criteria Number 4 which is "the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural or engineering type or style, or method of construction and suggested that further research be completed", that information is also included in your packet under the Inventory Form. That was the full statement of significance in that form.

The integrity of the structure seems to be a question that I'm sure the applicant will speak more to but I would like to highlight a couple pieces of information that the applicant provided as staff shows the physical integrity of the structure. They hired a third party building inspector, a fellow by the name of Don Hedquist and he did a report that was dated April 30, 2007 (this is included in your packet). I believe also that Mr. Hedquist's resume is also included with that. Just a quick highlight of the report and I'm not going to go in to deep detail I'm sure the applicant will go further into that. But the report really consists of merely cosmetic and mechanical issues but there were a few structural issues that I wanted to mention that was stated. They addressed the footings and foundation; they said there was no frost footing under the front 1/3 of the structure or the rear addition. This resulted in floor bowing which resulted in pulling away from the outside walls in several occasions. The applicants have photos of this which is included in your packets. I'm sure that the applicants will show those when they have a chance to speak. They also mentioned roofing and soffits have been deteriorating to a level that the area is allowing water to penetrate onto and reaching into the wall and causing damages both to the exterior stucco and trim and also the floor joists and the structural components of the home. That is just a quick summarization of what they submitted there.

Going back to the historical integrity of the structure, there are some original elements still intact on this home. It was structured in 1915 and that obviously was clapboard. The clapboard is still underneath the structure as the inspector had stated in his report that you can actually see and reach back at the clapboard underneath the structure as it is deteriorating. It also has original wood shingles in the gable and the multi-painted windows are also gabled In the transom of the bay

window here. It still contains stained glass windows in that bay and also it has the original Tuscan columns. Even though the porch was enclosed, it was enclosed around those columns so it has the very simple Tuscan columns that you see around the porch and those are original.

In 1724 Colfax Avenue was constructed in a Queen Anne style but does not contain many of the ornamental features and high design of many of those which the City's locally designated Queen Anne's such as the John Lohmar House or the Donald Cattanach House. It also has the original window openings; however, the applicant has stated that these windows are in poor condition. However, the form functions of those windows are still in place along with the original windows.

In the proposed changes, the applicant is actually proposing to demolish the property which is the reason why we're here before you today. The applicant is also planning on constructing a new home. They have supplied some renderings of that home today and I'm just going to show a quick example of what they have provided and I'm sure that they will speak again more to that. This would be the view of Colfax, so this would be the front view of what we're looking at here and this would be the view along Douglas (side view and backside view). The applicants have not indicated how much the cost would be to rehabilitate the structure. But they have indicated the cost of demolition at \$17,000 and an additional \$10,000 for lead and asbestos abatement. The applicants have also been in contact with the Green Institute to salvage the recyclable parts of the structure (there is an attachment in your packets which is a bid from the Green Institute looking at what items they would be looking at for salvage). Included in that bid they offered that they would take flooring, doors, hardware, casements, molding, stain glass, lights, cabinets and fixtures for reuse, salvage and sale.

Staff is recommending approval of the demolition setting the following findings:

1. The structure was constructed in a Queen Anne style with irregular projections and massing. However, the structure does not exhibit the same ornamental features found on most locally designated Queen Anne structures.
2. The historical integrity of the structure is impaired by the 1915 rear addition and the stucco is covering the original clapboard siding of the structure. While this addition and stucco impair the integrity of the structure, the structure still does exhibit the original materials which provide some historical integrity including the bay window openings which I mentioned. The wood shingles and the gables and the stain glass, transom and the other form and function of the structure.
3. The 2006 Historic Resource Inventory of the Calhoun-Isles Area identified the John Speedy House at 1724 Colfax as a contributing property to a proposed historic district and recommended intensive level of research and survey to be done of the residential development of the Groveland Addition. The John Speedy House was stated to have possible significance under Criteria No. 4 which I mentioned earlier.
4. The John Speedy House was not recommended for further research as an individual designated landmark. It was only as a member of this larger collection of homes that made up the Groveland Addition.
5. The John Speedy House is located in the Groveland Addition Residential Area potential historic district identified by Mead & Hunt in the survey completed in 2006. This report states that many of the structures in this potential district are built between 1893 and 1916 and they are characterized by brick or stone masonry. The subject of structure was constructed in 1885 and was originally covered in clapboard siding. This construction in 1885 is seven years before the Lowry family began marketing the land in the Groveland Area and eight years prior to the period of significance that was mentioned in the Mead & Hunt report. However, the lots were platted in 1872.

6. At this point, the applicants have not submitted the estimate for the cost to rehabilitate the structure.

7. The third party building official hired by the applicants state the following findings in his inspection report of the building:

a. It was originally built as the applicant states with mediocre construction (substandard footings, and lack of good bones.

b. Has undergone several major exterior additions; the 1902 addition, 1915 two-story sleeping porch which also resulted in the stuccoing of the dwelling and the 1912 addition of a one-stall detached garage.

c. It also has undergone multiple tenant internal reconfigurations and its conversions from a single family home to a duplex and then to a triplex.

d. It's in major disrepair and evidence shows that it has not been cared for due to the water intrusion, the holes and the soffits in the roof and some of the outdated systems that are currently in there.

8. The 2006 Historic Resource Inventory of the Calhoun-Isles Area stated that this proposed historic district called the "Groveland Additional Residential Area" as identified by deed restrictions including the standard 25 foot front year setback. Under the modern zoning ordinance that we have today on this area located in the R2 two-family district, this has a minimum front yard setback of 20 feet which is not the 25 feet which was on the deed restrictions. However, the zoning ordinance has a piece in there if you are familiar with it called "the established front yard setback" which means that the front of this home can not go any further than the front of the homes that are adjacent. In this situation it could not come any closer to the street than 1716 Colfax which is the property to the north which exhibits that rough 25 foot setback. So with that, staff is recommending approval of the demolition of the application for the property known as John Speedy House located at 1724 Colfax with the following conditions:

1. A complete application to construction of a new home on the site shall be submitted and approved by CPED Planning before the issuance of a wrecking permit on the site.

2. The applicant shall also provide the opportunity for a re-use organization to bid on the salvage of the materials from the structure.

So with that I'll open up for questions.

Chair Koski: We have one immediate question for you, Commissioner Larson?

Commissioner Larson: Brian, can you point out to me where it's indicated that the house is not recommended for further research as an individually designated landmark?

Brian Schaffer: Chair Koski and Commissioner Larson there is not a point in study that states that it should not be recommended as an individual landmark, it only stated that it should not be recommended as part of this larger collection.

Commissioner Larson: Are the other properties in the report that is identified to be specifically studied?

Brian Schaffer: There are other properties in the report that are identified individually as recommended for further study.

Chair Koski: So it's fair to say this one didn't make the cut?

Brian Schaffer: Chair Koski that would be my assumption in this case.

Chair Koski: Any other questions for staff? Commissioner Ollendorf?

Commissioner Ollendorf: I guess I'm confused by that last one because Page 2 of your report "Individual Significance" the quote appears to come out of the Survey Inventory Form that Mead & Hunt prepared and the last sentence was "suggested that further research be completed".

Brian Schaffer: Yes, actually if we opened up a copy of the Inventory Report I can go grab one from my files, it does state your honor (if you're familiar with the Inventory Form) there are multiple instances where those pieces would come out. It does state that it would be up for further research as individual property and then under another section it purely states that it should be done as part of the Groveland Addition. So, I can understand where the confusion comes from. That further research should be done as part of the further research of the Groveland Addition. Chair Koski and Commissioner Larson that would be my interpretation of that.

Chair Koski: Does that answer satisfy you Commissioner Ollendorf? Okay, any other questions for staff? Seeing none then I'm opening the public hearing. Before I open it up completely though, how many people want to speak to this issue and if you could just raise your hands? Okay, so there's not too many. If we could try to limit discussion or comments to this to roughly 4 or 5 minutes I would appreciate that. So whoever wishes to speak for or against this application please step forward and speak your name into the microphone and say your piece.

Lee Trecker: Good evening, thank you, I'm Lee Trecker and I'm the owner of the property at 1724 Colfax. My partner and I purchased this property in March, 2007. We have renovated a couple of different houses in the City notably 2212 Colfax and 3305 East Calhoun Parkway. We looked at this property and found that it was not salvageable as a single family home and because of the deteriorated condition and the configuration as a nonconforming triplex; we began the process of looking at replacing the existing structure with a contextual new single family home. By doing that process we hired on some people to look at it with us and I brought along with me Nate Wissink with Streeter & Associates as our developer. We've got Don Hedquist who was our third party inspector for the property and I've also got Tim Alt with Aultist Architecture and Design who is designing the property for us. I've asked Nate to speak a little bit on the property and give some examples of the deteriorated condition that it's in.

Chair Koski: Thank you.

Nate Wissink: Hi, I'm Nate Wissink with Streeter and Associates; I just want to quickly outline just a couple of things to highlight/complement Brian's report so that you guys get a good visual of the condition of the property. One of the things that you will get from these – this is the one stall garage that's associated with the property in the back which was built in 1912. You can see the condition of that. It's covered in clapboard and the gross setting aesthetically it doesn't complement any of the other homes in the area and structurally it is in bad shape. This is a bow of a typical connection on the home which highlights the deterioration and decay on those fascia levels from the stucco to facing to soffit to the trim and essentially in order to with this detailing is poor care of the home for the last 50 years. Before Pete and Todd purchased it, it was owned by a family for 50 years and the care for the home was not very well and so as a result of that the moisture intrusion as a whole, the foundational issues it would really require almost tearing off everything and rebuilding the house one piece at a time. So that pictures the details and here's another picture of the fascia and you can see that there is a substantial hole here, you can see the decay, the moisture build up, so this wall is completely rotted. The windows do not fit the openings anymore they are covered in wet paint, just poor detailing a wrong home which has resulted in again moisture intrusion and structural issues. Here's a picture of the basement, you can see in this area the water coming in, the water build up here, most of the limestone exhibits a lot of effervescent as well as decay and deterioration. A lot of the floor in the basement is broken up and the basement ceiling height is actually 6 ½ feet tall and there is a crawl space in front of them because they were not frost fittings in the front. And in the rear two-story 1915 addition has no frost footings either so the sloping and bowing of the house from a structural standpoint, prime type development. As far as pulling away, this supporter and the typical condition of the house where the floors in the rooms are actually sloping and all wood floors basically will pull away from the home so that there is an inch gap around most of the front of the home because of the sloping.

On the reconfiguration point, you can see that this is a picture of the upstairs but the patch analysis associated with the reconfiguration of the loss in the original floor plan. This is a picture of the kitchen, none of the kitchens are original in the home and there are three kitchens in the home and really there's not anything that might make this characteristic about that. From a perspective of moldings and integrity, most of the moldings in the home are not consistent so there are 4 or 5 different molding types. This is the case in the living room and there is a lot of intrusion and the molding has basically become decorative. When Don in his reported referenced the mediocre construction of the home provided that this was original and, I'm not positive it is, but a lot of the connections in the home shows that wherever there is detailing it is not consistent so you can see that none of it was matched up to connect in a decorative way. And just to highlight some of the things that was highlighted in the Mead & Hunt report where the columns which actually there is a permit that was pulled in 1997 that the columns were replaced on the home. This window here was highlighted and you can see that it has many cracks in it and the shingles in the gable basically are virtually all rotted and covered with lead paint. So from the standpoint of its integrity and structural foundation issues an overall ability to renovate it from a cost and intensive point of view to redo this home, it would be completely more expensive than doing something new and solo and logistically complex because you would basically have to restart and tear apart piece by piece, square for trim, pour a new foundation and then find out what's rotten and what is not rotted and reassemble the home. With impinges and the different additions in the home it really doesn't lend itself in doing it.

That's really my comments, I did want to add one thing that Lee and Todd want to be good neighbors and so they think it is important to involve the neighbors in the project. One thing that they've done is met individually with many of the nearby neighbors and has talked with them and showed them the proposed plans and schematics associated with the project. I've got here. if I can make this part of the public record, this a map showing the block that they're on and the green parcel here is the subject parcel and these residencies along the Kersay's residencies here and these

residents have all written letters of support for demolition and the new project. So I'd like to make those part of the public record. So if I can I'd like to read just one letter from Barry and Mary Lazarus who owns the immediate property to the north.

"Dear Nate,

Mary and I appreciate the tour you provided at 1724 Colfax Avenue South and the courtesies of reviewing the proposed plan to replace the existent structure. We are the adjoining lot of 1724 Colfax which is a home in need of major repair and demolition. As far as we know 1724 Colfax is no architectural importance and we prefer that it be demolished. Your proposed single family dwelling will be a significant improvement to the Lowry Hill Neighborhood. Please forward a copy of this letter to the Heritage Preservation Commission so that it is aware of our support for demolition of the existing house and replacement thereof with a home substantially similar to the schematic drawing shown to us. After our review of your proposed architectural plans and your discussion with us it is apparent that you have studied our neighborhood, this site in the 1700 block of Colfax. We thank you for working to achieve a classic contextual design for the new construction.

Sincerely,

Barry and Mary Lazarus with a copy of Council Member Goodman."

In the other letters and there are 10 letters total in here and 7 are on the block with them and most of the exemplar of what Barry and Mary have indicated in theirs.

Chair Koski: I think most of those letters we had in our packet or we received them for the meeting. But if you want to hand the copies that you have to the clerk he can distribute them to us. Thank you. And then you had a couple of our people in mind to speak? Okay, thank you. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak, Ms. MacDonald?

Ms. MacDonald: Good evening Chair Koski and members of the Commission, my name is Bonny MacDonald. I'm the executive director of the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota and tonight I'm here to encourage the Heritage Preservation Commission to deny the application before you for a demolition permit of the John Speedy House at 1724 Colfax Avenue South. The Speedy House has been identified as a contributing property to the proposed Groveland Addition Residential Area Historic District. In its study of the district Mead & Hunt determined that the Speedy House may meet local designation Criteria No. 4 embodying the distinctive characteristics of an architectural type and therefore a designation study should be undertaken. It is true that the Speedy House is not a high styled example of Queen Anne architecture; however, our vernacular architecture can also convey broad patterns of our development. As an early property in the neighborhood this structure demonstrates the architectural genesis of a neighborhood now rich with stylistic variation. We must consider this property in the broad view of the alarming teardown rate in Minneapolis. Speculative developers have identified many of our vernacular structures as teardowns rather than accessing the existing properties, reuse potential or the greater value to the community. The Speedy family may not have made an extraordinary mark on the City of Minneapolis but their home speaks to the importance of the average worker in building our great city. In the demolition application the

property owner argues that this property is functional obsolete and that restoration is not feasible. If the owner were to take the dollars invested in demolition and new construction and apply this to the existing structure the rehabilitated property could be competitive in the existing housing market we believe.

The Lowry Hill residents were presented with the option of demolition but we believe that if they had been presented with the option of a rehabilitative property that they could have chosen that as well as a neighborhood cornerstone. Finally, demolishing this property would not achieve the City's sustainability goals. The greenest building is the one that was already built. Demolishing this property would contribute to viability building materials to the landfills as well as using additional natural resources for the new construction. We do not believe that mold, archaic mechanical systems or the need for soffits replacement all of which can be remediated are enough cause for demolishing a historical property and wasting our natural and cultural resources. The Preservation Alliance of Minnesota strongly encourages the Heritage Preservation Commission to deny this application. We ask you to protect our vernacular architecture and its contribution to the broad patterns of our history. Thank you for your consideration. Do you have any questions for me?

Chair Koski: Are there any questions for Ms. MacDonald? I don't see any. Thank you very much. Is there anybody else that wishes to speak to this application?

Diane Montgomery: Good afternoon Commissioners, Diane Montgomery, 1023 Mt. Curve and you have the letter from the Lowry Hill History Committee with its attachments. I will hand the clerk as part of the record the original, signed petition with the addresses of the neighborhood residents who are against demolition of this property. The two sentence adherence that they signed when they agreed to this as opposed to the owner/developer that presented a map of actually my block in Lowry Hill. I was never contacted and I live within the city block that they presented their properties and apparently I'm an un-contacted person on the same block. As of further comment on that particular contact, the neighborhood map, the relevant homeowners for responding to this particular petition are not necessarily only the five properties on one side of Coflax or the four properties on Dupont which are in back of the house. This particular property is viewed from the other side of Thomas Lowry Park – it is a triangle – there are neighborhood houses, neighbors who have signed our petition who do not want to look at this new substitute for facility that has been proposed by this developer. Further in comparing the addresses of the homeowners signing our demolition protest letter are residents on Mt. Curve across from the other side of Mt. Curve triangle -- Thomas Lowry Park, Groveland Terrace, Dupont, Emerson and I believe we have Freemont and Girard people. People in Lowry Hill regard the park, the only park, in our neighborhood as the center of the neighborhood and they all feel that the first house -- the first residential building coming into the area by the park is relevant to them not just to the one or two property owners. So, if I could take a moment to pass the original petition and signatures here to the clerk for the record. I have only three other short points. First of all, the neighborhood has long considered this property its own little historic house. It doesn't conform – it was there before Thomas Lowry platted things. It's not its fault that it's put in the wrong place relative to Thomas Lowry setbacks and his lot line designs. It's actually not a criticism of the house and it's actually a characteristic of its pre-Lowry status. It was a little house way on the block as you see by our attachment of the 1903 Minneapolis map, the only house on the block. So it didn't fit in because it was nothing to fit into at that time. Many of the other houses that are noted on that map were also vernacular styled wooden houses and they've long since gone. So the area as it was early in 1885, 122 years ago, was not necessarily an area of brick and stone Thomas Lowry favorite mansions. The second point that I wanted to make is that the neighborhood has long recognized this house as one of theirs. As early as the 1980s as you see as it was identified as one of the oldest houses in the neighborhood in the Hill and Lake Press article asking people to come forth with information about their houses.

Further it's been the focal point in Thomas Lowry Park, Groveland Terrace and the area of many walking tours. Tours for out-of-town tourists, our institute tours, University of Minnesota continuing education tours. As you see by one of the tours we had, I think it was tour No. 4; back in 1981 it was a Number 1 stop on the tour. It is the oldest house looking down all the different ages of the houses on the tour that included some of the Thomas Lowry Houses. It was the only early survivor there. So the people in the neighborhood who've lived there a long time, I did note that two of the people attaching letters of dissent to the letter of approval to this demolition; one does not live in the area yet – they're residents from out-of-town and they've just purchased the house in back of this particular candidate. They don't live there and they haven't moved in and they are renovating their house but they wrote; that's Dr. Satterberg, They are writing a letter supporting the demolition of the seed of the Speedy House. The other one has also lived in the neighborhood less than 6 or 8 months so of the letters supporting demolition that are attached to the original owner packet, none of those people as far as I see are here today. Two of the four are not names of long-time residents (I'm a third generation Lowry Hill resident) would recognize the people supporting the opposition to this demolition. They've signed their names, given the addresses and they've lived in the neighborhood a long time. The last point is the condition of the house issues. I was not able to go through the house – the first few Open Houses that apparently the owner offered. I was not informed and I never received a letter. I only live a block away. But in talking with many of the people who signed their petition they never received notice that this was happening. They had no idea that there was a proposal to demolish this and when most of them heard they were distressed and eager to sign this petition. We did this in two or three days and I'm sure there are another 4 or 5 pages worth of names – there are 25 homeowners who have already said that this can't happen. They looked at the proposal (the sketch) not a real proposal, the sketch that was provided by the new owner and they said this is a McMansion, this is a teardown and you understand their response. In looking more carefully at the support for demolition offered by the current owner, he offers condition characteristics primarily of the two porches that were added on the rear and later turned into housing units in the 50s, 60s and 70s and probably were rooming houses. Lots of Lowry Hill were rooming houses, almost all of Colfax were rooming houses at one time. So the deficiencies of saying that a lack of frost footings on the front or of the back porches that are now turned into housing units which should have never been housing units really are not adequate is not surprising at all. The main house still is not un-savable and I pointed out in the letter that many houses in our neighborhood all over Minneapolis actually are not up to some of the standards of criticism that this particular independent inspector levied at this house. For example, 150 gallon hot water heater shared by three bathrooms doesn't seem grounds for demolishing a house at least in our area yet and lead piping or the need for a new roof. So, we've seen and you have all seen lots of houses where they say nothing is savable, nothing is workable in our neighborhood and I gave some of the addresses of some.

Chair Koski: Ms. Montgomery you are making your point, could you wrap up in the next thirty seconds or so?

Ms. Montgomery: Absolutely. That was my point on the condition. I would only refer the Commission to the issue of was the HPC Building Inventory Form study did it or did it not indicate that this house was suitable for local designation. I refer to the builder's packet, Page 1 of his enclosure of the building form inventory for this property and the footnote on that consultant recommendation: "recommends intensive level survey and research this part of a distinctive area residence". So there was recommendation for local designation on this property. And the very last ten seconds is the standard for approval of a demolition of a property under your ordinances would require unsafe conditions of a historic residence, unsafe and dangerous conditions and no reasonable alternative. I think most of the people living in the neighborhood who are familiar with Lowry Hill housing or Minneapolis housing in general would look at some of the criticisms of the

condition of this property and deem it not unsafe. It was lived in until it was acquired recently – it's lasted 122 years and it's not going to blow over tonight. Thank you.

Chair Koski: This is a public hearing is there anybody else who wishes to speak to this application.

Ms. Crystal McDougal: I'm Crystal McDougal, I don't have a title, and I'm simply a resident for the last five years. The reason I wanted to speak is that I bought a similar property I would say five years ago. It was a non-conforming triplex that at one time had been a boarding house with five units and we've restored it to a lovely home and neighbors regularly thank me. I feel like I've provided a real service. It was almost at the hands of a developer and wrecking ball completed with the Amsley Persal addition that would have been lost. I encourage the owners of 1724 Colfax to consider doing the same thing. It is very satisfying to revitalize and to bring a home back and it doesn't take as much as it often appears to be on the surface. Secondly, I helped collect names in the neighborhood and everybody I approached enthusiastically signed – there was nobody that opposed the opposition statements. There was a shared sentiment amongst everyone that they bought homes in the neighborhood because of the historical quality of the neighborhood and they're really concerned about the loss of that. There was a wide range of homeowners and diverse architectural styles that was the biggest point. They want to preserve the historic quality and the charm of the neighborhood and are very nervous about the creep of the new bigger whatever. Thank you.

Chair Koski: Thank you. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak and then sir you can go right after her.

Ms. Susan Greenberg: I'm Susan Greenberg and I live at 1005 Mt. Curve which is at the opposite corner and I haven't been in the neighborhood as long as Diane but I am in total support of demolition or whatever the new owners care to do with it. We've lived with that property under disrepair for sixteen years. I've lived on Mt. Curve and I would very much like to support these folks coming into our neighborhood. If you've been in the house, it clearly has not been taken care of on any level, any level of any other house that I've been in Lowry Hill and I've been on Mt. Curve for 16 years and on Irving for 5 years before that. So I know the Lowry Hill and Kenwood Neighborhoods, this is not representative of this neighborhood and I just would support the demolition.

Chair Koski: Thank you. Yes sir.

Mr. Bill Payne: My name is Bill Payne. I've been a continuous resident of the City of Minneapolis for 39 years. My first house – my home – my apartment was actually located on the corner of Bryant and Douglas, one block from the subject property. So I've been looking at this house for a long period of time. Since then I've owned four other houses in Minneapolis; two of which I personally renovated and I now live in another renovated house 1912 Mt. Curve Avenue which is diagonally across Thomas Lowry Park from the subject property. One of the houses that I renovated had been divided into twelve rooms and apartments. It was restored to a single family residence, so I know that it's possible through hard work and diligence to restore these houses. This house is located on Lowry Hill and sits on Lowry Park – it's in the Groveland Addition which was platted by Thomas Lowry and it sits on Douglas Avenue on which Thomas Lowry's streetcars ran. This was the first house on its block in the neighborhood and it does have historic significant -- it should be

considered. This is not a pretty house and it is obviously in need of repair but no more so than many houses in the Lowry Hill area – lead paint, patched floors -- those are all common problems that can be dealt with. Unfortunately, I don't think the owners have really presented a full consideration of what is possible. What they've said is it's simply too hard, we need to tear this house down and start over. I think we need to have a better understanding of the possibilities. The site of this house might offer some wonderful opportunities for renovation. It sits on the northwest corner of Colfax and Douglas but it sits on the southeast portion of the lot. The lot is not 50 feet wide – it's 75 feet wide. When considered with the property that's part of the property, all of that could be turned into a part of a renovation which I think would be supported by the neighborhood. Furthermore, what has been proposed, well I don't think its part of the question of whether this building should be demolished or not, but what has been proposed is a residence which is not characteristic of the historical homes in the Lowry Hill neighborhood. It looks like a very nice house but it's not in a historical context to this neighborhood. I would hope that this commission, the Historic Preservation Commission, can deny the demolition permit to carry out its mission and to suggest to these property owners that they do something that will in fact carry on with the historic aspects of the neighborhood rather than submitting to us a newly constructed inappropriate house. Thank you for your consideration.

Chair Koski: Is there anybody else who wishes to speak? Yes sir.

Staff Jack Byers: Mr. Chair, a reminder that we need the speakers to sign in.

Chair Koski: Please and where are they doing that Mr. Byers, is it outside?

Jack Byers: Yes, I believe that it is outside in the hallway.

Chair Koski: It's outside in the hallway. So if you do speak, make sure that you sign your name in the record outside.

Mr. Tom Baulkin: Members of the Commission my name is Tom Baulkin and I'm a life-long resident of Minneapolis. I've been quite active in state and local historical organization and I have given historical walking tours and historical classes for Community Ed from time to time. In a former life, I was the environmental review coordinator for the Department of Natural Resources and that meant that we were responsible for the Environment Review program which involved avoiding and minimizing impacts to natural and historic resources. The review process must consider in this case the building itself which is over 120 years old and the surrounding historic neighborhood made even more important by Thomas Lowry Park, a public resource that enhances and is enhanced by the neighborhood and its historic structures – it's a symbiotic relationship here. I think impacts and alternatives to teardown and rebuild need to be thoroughly investigated to preserve the historic integrity of the structure in question as well as the historic neighborhood. I believe it's necessary to conduct a thorough review with public input of a proposed project and impacts and alternatives before this matter proceeds further. Thank you.

Chair Koski: Thank you. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak? Welcome back Mr. Glathey.

Mr. Glathey: Thank you, I think you probably already know my name. I'm Bob Glathey, 4842 Northrop Drive; it's good to be back in the chambers. If on the other side of the desk from my five years as a commissioner, I guess I would like to just give a little other background of myself. I've lived in Lowry Hill for 18 years and I've been doing historical research about the neighborhood for 30 years and 20 years ago I did a survey of the 720 buildings in the neighborhood so I'm fairly familiar with it. I also at the request of the Commission did walking tours of Lowry Hill for five years while I was a commissioner – all of those tours started in front of the John Speedy House. It is an important house. I guess I would like to present you with a little broader view and not start off focused exactly on the house. Almost 100 years ago the lot across the street from the Speedy House was still vacant and a developer took out permits to build apartment buildings on it. The neighbors were concerned, gathered together, talked, pooled their money and bought the land back from that developer and gave it to the City of Minneapolis with a condition that it becomes a park. That's why we have Thomas Lowry Park today because of concerned neighbors in the area and what a park it became. Over many years it was known to the neighbors as 7 Pools Park because of the seven pools and flowing water in it. More recently it was honored with the name of Thomas Lowry who developed the area. Two years ago, as many of you may recall, I was in the process of putting together a nomination for Historic District in Lowry Hill which would have included the Speedy House at 1724 Colfax. It would have been a contributing property to that district. I might also point out that the survey that this Commission requested and which was done by Mead & Hunt last year included a proposed or a possible historic district in Lowry Hill and that also included the Speedy House., the park and the houses around it. The park is a real jewel and a jewel is enhanced by the gems of houses that surround the park. As mentioned earlier that there are many architect designed buildings in the neighborhood. There are 13 houses that face the park. In addition to the Speedy House, of the other 12, eleven of them were designed by a Who's Who of Architects from the turn of the century. So it's a real concentration of architectural design by the finest of architects.

I don't think anywhere in Minneapolis would you find such a concentration of architect designed homes. It's been important to organizations; the University Club of the U of M was located in one of those houses facing the park for 40 years. The Swedish Consulate was in one of the houses facing that park for many years. We talked earlier about whether buildings are savable or not. We have not lost a house facing the park in more than 40 years. Thirty years ago, after a horrendous fire, 818 Mt. Curve was left with only the front wall and part of two side walls of that house designed by Harry Wilde Jones. That house, 95 percent destroyed was restored and is now two very nice townhouses and retains the façade that it originally had. So when we talked about condition, I'm always confused as to why we're talking about condition when we're really trying to decide whether a property is historic or not. Just about anything can be restored. I'd like to respond to some of the things that were said earlier. One of the owners I believed referred to the historic hardware and parts of the house that we're going to be handled by a reuse company. It is kind of contradictory to what Diane Montgomery and I were told by the owners when we toured the house. They said that Mr. Lazarus who wrote the letter that was read was going to be given the hardware. Item of frost footing on the porches is silly. I don't know if you could find 10 houses in all of Lowry Hill that have frost footings under their porches. They weren't built that way. If stucco is bad, sometimes the stucco is protecting the clapboard and it's actually a plus in restoring a house. The house looked very strong when I saw it. I don't understand why the report found it so negative. It's a house that certainly can be saved, a house that should be saved and to lose it would really be a crime. I encourage you to not permit this house to be demolished.

Chair Koski: Thank you. This is a public hearing is there anybody else who wishes to speak. Yes sir.

Mr. Don Hedquist:: My name is Don Hedquist and I did the inspection of the house and in the reference developed the footing. The part of the footing that I was referring to was under the house not under the porch. When you go to the basement of that house you'll find that they had dug out part of it to accommodate the furnace that they put in there. But the other part of the basement, it's a crawl space. They did dig out part of it to accommodate some duct work that go to the front of the house. At the time this house was built it was quite common to put foundation sometimes only a few inches to a few feet (and not even a few feet below the surface) and then you didn't excavate on the inside. What you did then is at a later date if you wanted to have a full basement, you would excavate and then you would have to underpin the house to hold it up while you're doing the excavation or quite common on the houses that didn't have a frost footing under they would excavate within about 2 to 3 feet of the perimeter wall and then you'll find that they've got a ledge at the foundation there. Then they've got another wall in there about 2 to 3 feet from the perimeter because that other wall is there to hold the dirt, to keep it from undermining the foundation. In order to get a foundation under this house to make it suitable for rebuilding you would have to excavate down to get a frost footing – a minimum of frost footing and I don't know why you would consider anything besides that because if you don't have frost footing the house is going to move when you have freezing weather and if you haven't had a snow cover. If you get a lot of snow cover in the fall the frost will go down under the footing and then the heat loss from within the house will keep the ground from freezing and that way you can keep the house in place. But you have to rely on Mother Nature to bring snow. The clapboard siding on the house, the stucco that's on the house and water has been going behind it and so that's going to cause decay of the members there. When they showed the photos of the walls and the floor – the separation – on these houses it was very common to do what they call "bloom framing". When they did the bloom framing you had a 2 x 4 wall that went from the first floor all the way to second floor. They would put a 1 x 4 ledger mortised into 2 x 4 and then they would nail the joist onto that. With that type of construction, if you have a lot of decay it will rust the nails and then if you have a wind it will move the wall outward and then you could get the separation between floor and the walls. And now you have to pull those walls back in and you have to do something about the bloom framing because you cannot have bloom framing anymore. You have to have fire stops between the walls. So my statement about the footings was not under the porch it was under the main house.

Chair Koski: Thank you for that clarification. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak to this application?

Mr. Wayne Trecker: I appreciate everybody coming out and speaking about the house and the condition of the house. I want to make known two things. We have tried to be very involved with the neighborhood and I think it's pretty obvious that there are some strong opinions both ways. In regard to this home, I think what we've done is we've taken the time to do the research associated with doing a third party inspection. We took a lot of time working with the history of the home and trying to determine whether or not it is historically significant. I think both the home findings as far as the structural and the irreparability of it as well as the historical nature deem it not designateable. One other thing I'd like to mention is that some of the other things and I think Don alluded to those; I was really disturbed by hearing some of the comments because they are not true and that is offensive. I just want to say that and there are several of them but that's problematic to me and I would appreciate it if that would not happen in the future. Thank you.

Chair Koski: Is there anybody else who wishes to speak? Anybody else, yes Madam. .

Ms. Leone Madeem: My name is Leone Madeem and I live at 1802 Girard Avenue South. I've lived there for 12 years and I'd like to start out by saying that I think the people of the world can be divided

into two groups – those that leveled houses and appreciate them and those that don't. Those of us who live in Lowry Hill feel very privileged to live there, it's charming, it has great heritage and personality and we want to keep it that way. We pay the highest taxes in the City because we love where we live and we don't want to see it torn down bit by bit which is happening. It was just another house torn down on Humboldt Avenue about 24th and Humboldt this past two weeks. We feel like we are losing what we bought when we moved in and it's a tragedy and it's something that you people can stop. We shouldn't have to be here and we shouldn't have to fight for every house. We shouldn't have to see our neighborhoods slowly eroding. There are 87 counties in this state and most of them would love new construction. They want new construction, we do not. We are asking you to protect what we have so lovingly brought to this point. Thank you.

Chair Koski: Is there anybody else? Seeing none, I'm closing the public hearing. Commissioners? Commissioner Messenger?

Commissioner Messenger: Thank you. I want to thank everyone who did get up to speak. It is always helpful for us to listen to your comments. You know when we look at these kinds of things, one of the things that we are really cognizant of is that functional loss of lessons and deferred maintenance is not a real reason for demolishing a historic resource. I for one would have a very difficult time supporting the staff's recommendation for demolition, not because of functional loss of lessons or deferred maintenance but really because of where it sits and the impact that it would have on a proposed district. I think it would be very detrimental to it and not every house is beautiful but they lend itself to the total fabric of the neighborhood. So, I would not be able to support the staff finding. Thank you.

Chair Koski: Was there somebody else, Commissioner Anderson? Sorry, I couldn't see your hand there.

Commissioner Anderson: Mr. Chairman I'd like to know what exactly are our options and if we deny demolition then what?

Chair Koski: I seem to remember in the staff report that was very clearly laid out. I don't know if the staff can point us to the page, was it this one or number 3.

Commissioner Anderson: Number 4 in the findings?

Brian Schaffer: Page number 4.

Chair Koski: I seem to remember another way that it was described which was very clear. Commissioner Anderson on Page No. 4, 5992230, if we determine that the property appears to meet at least one of the criteria then we can move to interim protection and further study and if we decide that its not a historical resource then we can move for the destruction. If we find that it is a historical structure but deemed to be removable then we can propose mitigation.

Commissioner Anderson: I read that but it's not very clear. Does it demand then that if we deny this demolition, does it mean that we also have to move to commence a designation study?

Chair Koski: Yes.

Brian Schaffer: Chair Koski and Commissioners if I may, the ordinance is pretty clear that if we move to deny the demolition permit we must commence a designation study. It does also state that there can be time for further research being done in that process but a designation study has to be an outcome from that.

Commissioner Anderson: Is there a time limit to that, do we have to commence this study immediately?

Brian Schaffer: Chair Koski and Commissioners I don't believe a time limit is stated, I think that it's a reasonable time limit that we would expect to put on ourselves. I believe Jack Byers could probably speak more to that.

Jack Byers: Mr. Chair and Commissioner Anderson, the Commission can put in place the interim protection. We do not stimulate the time frame for a designation study. The planning director would call for that designation study if directed by the Commission but CPED-Planning does not pay for the designation study that would be the responsibility of the applicant. So it would be based on the applicant's desire to either further proceed with the project or there time frame for being able to put together a designation study with a qualified consultant.

Commissioner Anderson: So we have some flexibility there.: I want to just add one personal thing to Commissioner Messenger's statement and that is I think we have to go back to our City inspectors for letting things like this happen. I don't know how we do that but I think what did you call it Commissioner Messenger?

Commissioner Messenger: Deferred maintenance.

Commissioner Anderson: Deferred maintenance, I think that certainly is an issue and this is a fine example of it -- bad example of it.

Chair Koski: Commissioner Larson?

Commissioner Larson: Thank you Chair. Having listened to the testimony on both sides, I came here undecided – having read through the information provided to us and I think hearing the testimony and receiving some of this information, one of the things that sort of came to life for me was the study that was done by Mead & Hunt seems to in some way almost just touch upon the

significance of the home. It talks about the architectural style and in some ways I find that one of the smaller points to this potential property: 1) is a gateway but 2) as the first in this block and the first in this potential designation area. While I am sensitive to deferred maintenance and issues of construction, I think many people have it right that with the will and the way, there is always a way to take something and rejuvenate it and make it better. We've worked with many properties to remove things that have been added on and changed in the past that are not historic such as some of these additions that were done early on. So, I think there is certainly opportunity for taking this property and restoring in some ways to its former glory. It may be simple and it may not be grand but at the same time I think it's about heritage. We're the Heritage Preservation Commission and so we go back to this often and its not just the particular structure but its about the people, the area, the neighborhood, its development and I think that this house does meet that. So, I'd like to move that we modify staff findings and deny the Certificate of Demolition.

Commissioner Messenger: I'll second that.

Commissioner Larson: I'd like to make a couple clarifications in the findings. I think it was interesting that the findings really are in some ways could be read either way and I think that what's most important here is Findings No. 4 should really read "the John Speedy House was recommended for intensive level survey and research as part of a distinctive area of residential development within the Groveland Addition".

Chair Koski: So that's modifying Finding No. 4?

Commissioner Larson: Yes that's correct and I actually think that's really the only thing that does need to be changed. I think all the other facts, the information on the integrity and condition of the property may be true but at the same time its not salvageable – we've seen plenty of properties renovated.

Chair Koski: In denying their motion to deny the demolition by the ordinance?

Commissioner Larson: I'm going to move for interim protection to establish the property from destruction or any appropriate alterations during the designation process.

Chair Koski: You must also ask the Planning Director to commence,

Commissioner Larson: Yes, direct the Planning Director to commence the designation study for this property.

Chair Koski: For this individual property or for a property that is contributing to a historical district?

Commissioner Larson: Since there is no historic district for this particular property.

Commissioner Anderson: This is the only building.

Chair Koski: For an individual designation? I just wanted to be clear about that because there are a number of discussion points that related to a potential historic district.

Commissioner Larson: Individual designation.

Chair Koski: So you've made those changes are they acceptable to you Commissioner Messenger?

Commissioner Messenger? Yes.

Chair Koski: Any other discussion on the motion before us, Commissioner Ollendorf?

Commissioner Ollendorf: Suggestion a friendly amendment, I had search throughout the document before finding I think in a newspaper article who John Speedy was and I would like to see that as part of the findings. Particularly, because this is an example of Queen Anne on the vernacular end of the spectrum and that relates to his past as a paint and wallpaper salesman.

Chair Koski: Can you point out the piece for me please? Could you re-say what your friendly amendment is?

Commissioner Ollendorf: It was in the packet from the Lowry History Committee, this newspaper article from the Hill and Lake Press. John Speedy the original owner was a print and wallpaper dealer in early Minneapolis and just basically to amend the findings to include a statement about John Speedy and his significance and in his time in Minneapolis.

Chair Koski: Commissioner Larson do you find that acceptable?

Commissioner Larson: I do accept that.

Chair Koski: Is there a way that you can actually provide some language?

Commissioner Ollendorf: Some verbiage, sure. However, the structure does not exhibit the same ornamental features found almost locally designated Queen Anne structures perhaps relating to

John Speedy social economic status as one of a common paint and wallpaper dealer or something to that affect.

Chair Koski: That I will not accept. Will you withdraw your friendly amendment and I will make my own?

Commissioner Ollendorf: Sure.

Chair Koski: I think your purpose is good and to make it a little clearer maybe a little bit more about who this gentlemen was and I think that if we amend Finding No. 1. The house was built in 1885 and by the building permit card the original owner was John Speedy a paint and wallpaper dealer in early Minneapolis. Is that clear and is that acceptable to you Commissioner Messenger?

Commissioner Messenger: Yes, it is.

Brian Schaffer: Mr. Chair and Commissioners if it will help in pursuing a designation study; the study would need to consider all seven potential criteria so we would expect research on significant persons.

Commissioner Messenger: It's fine with me but I don't think it's necessary.

Chair Koski: So the friendly amendment is accepted into the motion.

Commissioner Larson: Although not necessary.

Chair Koski: Well before we call the question, I just want to go on the record that this is another example, another application, before us for a demolition in a potential historic district. I think we are going to see more of this in the future with the phenomena of teardowns and especially with properties that have deferred maintenance. We also have a number of potential historic districts – handfulls of potential districts. It bothers me a little bit that every time somebody wants to improve a property either by demolition or addition they get flagged because the district is potential. But there is not political will to move ahead and to actually designate these districts. I think many of them deserve it and I think it's unfair to property owners that they are caught in this dilemma. Based on the merits presented before me tonight, I don't think that the property itself does merit individual designation. I think it would be a contributing property to a historic district. The creation of historic districts is not something that the HPC can do unilaterally, we do it in consort with the Planning Department, we do it in consort with Grass Roots organizations, neighborhood groups and we do it with the will of the City Council. In this case, we don't necessarily have all of that support so I am going to vote against the motion. Commissioner Messenger?

Commissioner Messenger: Thank you for saying what you did. It's very difficult for us to sit here and have all of the folks come forward and be concerned about a house that is a potential historic resource where within your own community you actually do have the power to put together this district. If you organize as well as you did tonight I think it would be beneficial to all of you to really move forward on some kind of a district designation. Thank you.

Chair Koski: Commissioner Crippen?

Commissioner Crippen: I would share the Chair's comments with my frustration but I think I will vote for the current motion because I think we should hold demolition to the highest standard of review. I think its worthy to at least take a little more time to look at this property. There was a comment by Commissioner Larson that the findings were ambivalent enough that we didn't need to change and I found that problematic as well. While I think the end result may be that this house may not be designated and may be eligible for demolition, I think it's appropriate that we take precaution and go slowly as we look at that.

Chair Koski: Any other comments on the motion? I'm going to call the question all in favor of the motion say "Aye", all opposed – One "Nay" and that's myself, abstentions? **The motion carries and the application for demolition is denied and the recommendation to the Planning Director to commence a designation study is requested.** Thank you.

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS
CPED PLANNING DIVISION
HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**

FILE NAME: 1724 Colfax Avenue South
DATE OF APPLICATION: June 28, 2007
APPLICANT: Nate Wissink of Streeter & Associates
DATE OF HEARING: July 24, 2007
DATE OF APPEAL DEADLINE: August 3, 2007
HPC SITE/DISTRICT: John Speedy House/ Historic Resource
CATEGORY: Potential Historic Resource
CLASSIFICATION: Demolition of a Historic Resource
STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Brian Schaffer
DATE: July 17, 2007

A. DESCRIPTION:

The John Speedy House, located at 1724 Colfax Avenue South, was constructed in 1885 and designed by architect Frank Read. The two-story dwelling was built in a Queen Anne style with an open front porch and clapboard siding. The porch was likely enclosed in 1901 and the clapboard was covered in stucco and plaster in 1915. As part of the 1915 work a rear two-story sleeping porch was also constructed.

The house was originally built as a single family dwelling, but most recently was used as an illegal triplex. In 1946, building permits were issued to convert the dwelling into a duplex and add a rear exterior stairs. Official city records indicate the number of dwelling units to be two in the structure.

B. SIGNIFICANCE

Significance as part of a Potential Historic District

A 2006 Historic Resource Inventory of the Calhoun-Isles Area identified 1724 Colfax Avenue South as a contributing property to a proposed historic district called the "Groveland Addition Residential Area." The following is an excerpt from the Inventory Report prepared by Mead & Hunt

Lowry Hill Area and the Groveland Addition

The Lowry Hill area is generally bounded by Hennepin Avenue on the east, 22nd Street West on the south, Logan Avenue South on the west, and I-394 on the north. This area has long been associated with homes constructed for important individuals.

Thomas Lowry, founder of the Twin Cities streetcar system, and his father-in-law Calvin Goodrich platted the Groveland Addition in 1872. The addition included areas to the west and east of Hennepin

Avenue. Portions of the addition to the east of Hennepin Avenue are located outside the survey area. Lowry built a mansion (nonextant) two years after platting the Groveland Addition. The mansion was located on seven acres of high ground near the corner of Hennepin Avenue and Groveland Avenue, thus affording the common name of Lowry Hill to this area. The Groveland Addition was among the earliest sections of land near the lakes to be platted and comprised the western edge of high-style residential development in Minneapolis.

Rapid development of the Lowry Hill area did not commence until the 1890s, following improvements made to Hennepin Avenue and land surrounding Lake of the Isles. After the extension of electrified streetcar lines, the Lowry family began marketing real estate in the Groveland Addition in 1892. The large lots, at least 50 feet by 135 feet, on small blocks were offered to buyers at high prices and with restrictions written into the deeds to attract wealthy residents. Examples of these restrictions include a 25-foot front yard setback and a minimum home construction value of \$5,000.¹ Development expanded to areas adjacent to the Groveland Addition as real estate agents sold platted additions with similar restrictions.

Within the survey area, the majority of construction within the Groveland Addition occurred between approximately 1893 and 1916. Houses were built by prominent business leaders that included J.B. Hudson, Governor John Lind, and Annie and Elizabeth Quinlan. Leading Minneapolis architects designed the homes in fashionable Period Revival styles. Many of the homes feature brick and stone masonry construction and brick veneer. When compared to the surrounding homes, approximately nine city blocks of the Groveland Addition stand out among the rest. These particular blocks within the Groveland Addition display among the most outstanding examples of architecture found within the survey area. The homes are located on large lots, feature a consistent visual row of similar architectural style, form, and character along broad streetscapes, and retain excellent historic integrity.

Individual Significance

A Survey Inventory Form of the property indicates that the property meets local designation criteria number 4 “The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural or engineering type or style, or method of construction” and suggested that further research be completed. (see attachment four)

C. INTEGRITY OF STRUCTURE

Physical Integrity

The applicants hired a third party building inspector to determine the physical integrity of the structure. Don Hedquist’s report dated April 30, 2007 and resume are attached (See attachment two). The following are highlights from his report.

Foundation and Footings: No frost footings under the front 1/3 of the structure or the rear addition. This has resulted in the floor bowing which has resulted in the floor pulling away from the outside walls in several locations. In particular there has been outward movement in the north wall.

Roofing and Soffit: The roof and soffits have deteriorated to a level where water runs onto soffit boards and behind the stucco. The decaying soffits have become home to critters such as birds, squirrels and bats.

Exterior Stucco and Trim: The deteriorated soffits and roof is resulting in water infiltration behind the stucco exterior. This has resulted in the rotting of the rim joist, floor joists, clapboard siding, and sheathing. Approximately 60 percent of the rim joist would require replacement.

¹ Bob Glancy, "Theodore and Belle Wold House," City of Minneapolis, 2006, n.p.

Historical Integrity

The survey inventory form (see attachment four) listed the following architectural elements.

- Wood shingles in gable
- multi-pane window in gable
- Tuscan columns on front porch
- multiple bays on side elevations stained glass headers,
- brackets

1724 Colfax Avenue was constructed in a queen anne style, however it does not contain the same ornamental detail and the high design as many of the City's locally designated queen annes, such as John Lohmar House or the Donald Cattanach House. The structure has wood shingles in the gable and irregular massing which is consistent with style, but it lacks much of the ornamental detail such as spindles or brackets. It has simple tuscan columns on the front porch.

The windows openings are original. However, the windows are in poor condition and are missing the storm windows. Above the bay windows is an intact stained glass transom window.

The rear sleeping porch addition from 1915 is in keeping with the irregular massing typical of the Queen Anne style, the roof shape and design of the addition impair the historical integrity of the structure. The stucco that was applied over the original clapboard further impairs the structure's historical integrity.

D. PROPOSED CHANGES:

The applicant is applying for approval to demolish the John Speedy House located at 1724 Colfax Avenue South. The applicants are proposing to construct a new single family dwelling in its place. The applicants have submitted preliminary plans for the proposed home (see attachment 7). The applicant states that they have met with the surrounding neighbors regarding the design and have designed the home to meet the recently adopted infill housing text amendments regarding bulk, height and building coverage.

The proposed home will be reviewed by CPED-Planning staff and must meet the site plan review guidelines for new residential construction of one to four units and all other applicable zoning requirements. The applicants have submitted plans in good faith and this application to demolish the existing structure is not a review or approval of the proposed plans for the new home.

The applicants have not included an estimate for the cost to rehabilitate the structure, but have included an estimate for the demolition of the structure, \$17,000, and the lead/asbestos abatement \$10,000.

The applicants have been in contact with The Green Institute to salvage and recycle parts of the structure. Attachment 6 is a bid from The Green Institute for the salvage of flooring, doors, hardware, casement, molding, stain glass, lights, cabinets and fixtures.

E. APPLICABLE ORDINANCES:

Chapter 599. Heritage Preservation Regulation

ARTICLE V DESIGNATION

599.210. Designation criteria. The following criteria shall be considered in determining whether a property is worthy of designation as a landmark or historic district because of its historical, cultural, architectural, archaeological or engineering significance:

- (1) The property is associated with significant events or with periods that exemplify broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history.
- (2) The property is associated with the lives of significant persons or groups.
- (3) The property contains or is associated with distinctive elements of city identity.
- (4) The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural or engineering type or style, or method of construction.
- (5) The property exemplifies a landscape design or development pattern distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness or quality of design or detail.
- (6) The property exemplifies works of master builders, engineers, designers, artists, craftsmen or architects.
- (7) The property has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

599.230. Commission decision on nomination. The commission shall review all complete nomination applications. If the commission determines that a nominated property appears to meet at least one of the criteria for designation contained in section 599.210, the commission may direct the planning director to commence a designation study of the property. (2001-Or-029, § 1, 3-2-01)

599.240. Interim protection. (a) Purpose. Interim protection is established to protect a nominated property from destruction or inappropriate alteration during the designation process.

(b) *Effective date.* Interim protection shall be in effect from the date of the commission's decision to commence a designation study of a nominated property until the city council makes a decision regarding the designation of the property, or for twelve (12) months, whichever comes first. Interim protection may be extended for such additional periods as the commission may deem appropriate and necessary to protect the designation process, not exceeding a total additional period of eighteen (18) months. The commission shall hold a public hearing on a proposed extension of interim protection as provided in section 599.170.

(c) *Scope of restrictions.* During the interim protection period, no alteration or minor alteration of a nominated property shall be allowed except where authorized by a certificate of appropriateness or a certificate of no change, as provided in this chapter. (2001-Or-029, § 1, 3-2-01)

ARTICLE VIII. HISTORIC RESOURCES

599.440. Purpose. This article is established to protect historic resources from destruction by providing the planning director with authority to identify historic resources and to review and approve or deny all proposed demolitions of property.

599.450. Identification of historic resources The planning director shall identify properties that are believed to meet at least one of the criteria for designation contained in section 599.210, but that have not been designated. In determining whether a property is an historic resource, the planning director may refer to building permits and other property information regularly maintained by the director of inspections, property inventories prepared by or directed to be prepared by the planning director, observations of the property by the planning director or any other source of information reasonably believed to be relevant to such determination.

599.460. Review of demolition permits. The planning director shall review all applications for a demolition permit to determine whether the affected property is an historic resource. If the planning director determines that the property is not an historic resource, the demolition permit shall be approved. If the planning director determines that the property is an historic resource, the demolition permit shall not be issued without review and approval by the commission following a public hearing as provided in section 599.170.

599.470. Application for demolition of historic resource. An application for demolition of an historic resource shall be filed on a form approved by the planning director and shall be accompanied by all required supporting information, as specified in section 599.160.

599.480. Commission decision. (a) *In general.* If the commission determines that the property is not an historic resource, the commission shall approve the demolition permit. If the commission determines that the property is an historic resource, the commission shall deny the demolition permit and direct the planning director to commence a designation study of the property, as provided in section 599.230, or shall approve the demolition permit as provided in this section.

(b) *Destruction of historic resource.* Before approving the demolition of a property determined to be an historic resource, the commission shall make findings that the demolition is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property, or that there are no reasonable alternatives to the demolition. 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, costs of renovation and feasible alternative uses.

The commission may delay a final decision for a reasonable period of time to allow parties interested in preserving the historic resource a reasonable opportunity to act to protect it.

(c) *Mitigation plan.* The commission may require a mitigation plan as a condition of any approval for demolition of an historic resource. Such plan may include the documentation of the property by measured drawings, photographic recording, historical research or other means appropriate to the significance of the property. Such plan also may include the salvage and preservation of specified building materials, architectural details, ornaments, fixtures and similar items for use in restoration elsewhere.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (1990)

Building Site

Recommended:

-Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character. Site features can include driveways, walkways, lighting, fencing, signs, benches, fountains, wells, terraces, canal systems, plants and trees, berms, and drainage or irrigation ditches; and archeological features that are important in defining the history of the site.

-Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space.

-Providing continued protection of masonry, wood, and architectural metals which comprise building and site features through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems; and continued protection and maintenance of landscape features, including plant material.

Not Recommended:

-Removing or radically changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building site so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

-Removing or relocating historic buildings or landscape features, thus destroying the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space.

-Removing a historic building in a complex, a building feature, or a site feature which is important in defining the historic character of the site.

F. FINDINGS:

1. The structure was constructed in a Queen Anne style with irregular projections and massing. However, the structure does not exhibit the same ornamental features found on most locally designated Queen Anne structures.

2. The historical integrity of the structure is impaired by the 1915 rear addition and the stucco covering the original clapboard siding of the structure. While, the addition and stucco impair the integrity of the structure the structure does have some original materials which provide some historical integrity. The window openings, wood shingles in the gables, and the stain glass transom above the bay windows are original.
3. The 2006 Historic Resource Inventory of the Calhoun-Isles Area identified the John Speedy House at 1724 Colfax Avenue South as a contributing property to a proposed historic district called the “Groveland Addition Residential Area” and recommended it for intensive level survey and research as part of a distinctive area of residential development within the Groveland Addition.

The John Speedy House was stated to have possible significance under local designation criterion number four “The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural or engineering type or style, or method of construction.”

4. The John Speedy House was not recommended for further research as an individually designated landmark.
5. The John Speedy House is located in the Groveland Addition Residential Area potential historic district identified by Mead & Hunt in a survey completed in 2006. The Mead & Hunt report states that the many of the structures in this potential district are built between 1893 and 1916 and are characterized by brick or stone masonry. The subject structure was constructed in 1885 and was originally covered in clapboard siding. Its construction in 1885 is seven years before the Lowry family began marketing land in the Groveland Addition.
6. The applicants have not submitted an estimate for the cost to rehabilitate the structure.
7. The third party building official hired by the applicants stated the following findings in his inspection report of the building: 1724 Colfax is a home that:
 - Was originally built with mediocre construction (substandard footings, lack of good “bones”)
 - Has undergone several major exterior addition (1901 addition, 1915 two-story sleeping porch and addition, 1912 one-stall garage)
 - Has undergone multiple internal reconfigurations through its conversion to duplex and triplex
 - Is in major disrepair (it has not been cared for there is evidence of major water intrusion, decay, mold as well as inefficient and outdated systems)

8. The 2006 Historic Resource Inventory of the Calhoun-Isles Area stated that the proposed historic district called the “Groveland Addition Residential Area” is identified by deed restrictions including a standard 25 front yard setback. The subject property is located in the R2 Two Family District and has a minimum front yard setback of 20. Furthermore, the zoning ordinance will require any proposed structure on the site to be located no closer to the front property line than the adjacent dwelling located to the north at 1716 Colfax Avenue South. Any proposed structure will be required to meet the established front yard setback of the adjacent properties, which is likely to be the historic 25 foot front yard setback.

G. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission adopt staff findings and **approve** the demolition application of the property known as the John Speedy House located at 1724 Colfax Avenue South with the following conditions:

1. A complete application to construct a new home on the site shall be submitted and approved by CPED-Planning before the issuance of the wrecking permit.
2. The applicant shall provide the opportunity for an re-use organization to bid on the salvage of materials from the structure.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Application and Applicant Statement
2. Third Party Building Inspector Report by Don Hedquist
3. Map of Groveland Addition Residential Area
4. HPC Building Inventory Survey Sheet
5. Letters from Neighborhood Residents
6. The Green Institute Bid for Salvage of Materials
7. Draft Plans for Potential New Home
8. Photo Catalog of the Existing Structure