



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

Date: November 29, 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 action **denying** a Certificate of Appropriateness for property located at 4655 E 46th St. (BZZ-3791) by Andy Lesch of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board.

Recommendation: Notwithstanding the staff recommendation, the Heritage Preservation Commission **denied** a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction of a park building in the Wabun Picnic Area of the Minnehaha Fall Park Historic District

Previous Directives: N/A

Prepared or Submitted by: Molly McCartney, Senior Planner, 612-673-5811

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

Presenters in Committee: Molly McCartney, Senior 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: 12

Neighborhood Notification: The Longfellow Community Council and the Nokomis East Neighborhood Association were notified on October 23, 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: Andy Lesch of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board has filed an appeal of the decision of the Heritage Preservation Commission denying a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction of a park building in the Wabun Picnic Area of the Minnehaha Fall Park Historic District. The Heritage Preservation Commission voted 6-1 to deny the application at the November 6, 2007 public hearing. The applicant's appeal statement is included in the staff report.

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS
CPED PLANNING DIVISION
HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

FILE NAME: Wabun Picnic Area, Minnehaha Falls Park Historic District

DATE OF APPLICATION: September 17, 2007

APPLICANT: Andy Lesch, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

DATE OF HEARING: November 6, 2007

PUBLICATION DATE: October 30, 2007

END OF APPEAL PERIOD: November 16, 2007

HPC SITE/DISTRICT: Minnehaha Falls Park Historic District

CATEGORY: Contributing

CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness

STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Molly McCartney

DATE: October 23, 2007

A. SITE DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND:

The Minnehaha Park Historic District is one of few cultural landscapes that is formally recognized as an important historic resource in the City of Minneapolis with national and local historic designation. The Minnehaha Park Historic District was placed on the National Register of Historic Place in 1969 and locally designated in 1986. Minnehaha Park is part of the Grand Rounds park system that runs through the City of Minneapolis designed by landscape architect Horace W.S. Cleveland and implemented by Theodore Wirth. The Minnehaha Park District is recognized with the historic designations for many reasons, one being associated with a nationally renowned master landscape architect and an early example integrating nature into urban planning. In 1993, renovation preserved and restored the aging Minnehaha Park including historic sites within the park and the landscape itself. The renovation was preceded by a master park plan completed in 1992.

In addition to the landscape of the park, the district also includes several historic sites. The Minnehaha Princess Station is an ornate Victorian train depot built in the 1870s by the Minnesota Central Railway, later called the Milwaukee Road. The John H. Stevens House nearby was moved to the park in 1896 from its original location west of St. Anthony Falls. The Greek-revival house was built in 1849 and is regarded by some as the birthplace of Minneapolis. The Longfellow House also stands within the vicinity of the park. Robert F. Jones built the home in 1906 to complement his Longfellow Gardens and Zoo. The 10-room, two-story Georgian house is a replica of the Henry Wadsworth Longfellow House in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Other buildings in the district include the Refectory and the Pavilion. In addition, the District is adjacent to another nationally designated district, the Minnesota Soldiers Home.

The Minnehaha Park Historic District encompasses the entirety of the 193 acre park, which includes Minnehaha Falls, limestone bluffs and river overlooks along the Mississippi River. Vegetation in

the park consists of oak, elm, silver maple, basswood, hackberry and cottonwood trees, as well as native and prairie woodland wild flowers. The Park has many distinct areas, one being the Wabun Picnic Area, located in the northeast portion of the park, south of East 46th Street, and north of the Minnesota Soldiers Home.

Wabun Picnic Area

The Wabun Picnic Area was first developed as a park amenity in the 1920s as an automobile camp ground called the Minnehaha Auto Tourist Camp. Auto tourist camps came into fashion with the emergence of the automobile, prior to the modern day motel. The auto camp had permanent and temporary structures used as sleeping quarters. By the 1950s, the auto tourist camp was falling out of favor with the public, and the tourist camp quarters in Minnehaha Park were removed and new picnic shelters were built that were used for picnicking shelters and gathering spaces. The Wabun Picnic Area has not been improved since the changes in the 1950s. As part of the redesign of this area of the park, the 1950s picnic shelters were demolished in the summer of 2007, with approvals from CPED - preservation staff.

The proposed improvements for the Wabun Picnic Area include four new park shelters, wading pool, a restroom and pool mechanical building, parking lot improvements, and improved playground amenities.

B. PROPOSED CHANGES:

Despite the total scope of the Wabun Picnic Area, the current Certificate of Appropriateness only includes the restroom and pool mechanical building. This building is an octagonal, single-story structure that will house restrooms and changing areas for pool users, as well as house the mechanical equipment for the wading pool. The location of this structure is in the same location as a previous park shelter. The structure has metal doors, lap siding, rough faced block knee wall, and red asphalt shingles. The applicants have stated that the design of the building mimics the structure at Beard's Plaisance, a park located on the west side of Lake Harriet. The proposed structure is similar in color and materials of other Minnehaha Park structures. The red asphalt roof and beige color of the lap siding is consistent with the Refectory, the Pavilion, and other picnic shelters.

In addition, other work in the Wabun Picnic Area includes four open park shelters, wading pool, park lot improvements, and improved playground amenities. This work is not under the current Certificate of Appropriateness.

While the Minnehaha Falls Park District may have the potential to yield archeological information about indigenous and early European settlement, no information about archeological resources has been submitted by the applicant.

C. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:

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.

Protecting and maintaining buildings and the site by providing proper drainage to assure that water does not erode foundation wall; drain toward the building; nor erode the historic landscape.

Minimizing disturbance of terrain around buildings or elsewhere on the site, thus reducing the possibility of destroying unknown archeological materials.

Surveying areas where major terrain alteration is likely to impact important archeological sites.

Protecting, e.g. preserving in place known archeological material whenever possible.

Planning and carrying out any necessary investigation using professional archeologists and modern archeological methods when preservation in place is not feasible.

Protecting the building and other features of the site against arson and vandalism before rehabilitation work begins, i.e., erecting protective fencing and installing alarm systems that are keyed into local protection agencies.

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.

Evaluating the overall condition of materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, that is, if repairs to building and site features will be necessary.

Repairing features of buildings and the site by reinforcing the historic materials. Repair will also generally include replacement in kind with a compatible substitute material of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of features where there are surviving prototypes such as fencing and paving.

Replacing in kind an entire feature of the building or site that is too deteriorated to repair if the overall form and detailing are still evident using the physical evidence to guide the new work. This could include an entrance or porch, walkway, or fountain. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Designing and constructing a new feature of a building or site when the historic feature is completely missing, such as an outbuilding, terrace, or driveway. It may be based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building and site.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Designing new onsite parking, loading docks, or ramps when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of character defining features of the site.

Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserve the historic relationship between a building or buildings, landscape features, and open space.

Removing nonsignificant buildings, additions, or site features which detract from the historic character of the site.

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 or relocating historic buildings on a site or in a complex of related historic structures such as a mill complex or farm thus diminishing the historic character of the site or complex.

Moving buildings onto the site, thus creating a false historical appearance.

Lowering the grade level adjacent to a building to permit development of a formerly below grade area such as a basement in a manner that would drastically change the historic relationship of the building to its site.

Failing to maintain site drainage so that buildings and site features are damaged or destroyed; or, alternatively, changing the site grading so that water no longer drains properly.

Introducing heavy machinery or equipment into areas where their presence may disturb archeological materials.

Failing to survey the building site prior to the beginning of rehabilitation project work so that, as a result, important archeological material is destroyed.

Leaving known archeological material unprotected and subject to vandalism, looting, and destruction by natural elements such as erosion.

Permitting unqualified project personnel to perform data recovery so that improper methodology results in the loss of important archeological material.

Permitting buildings and site features to remain unprotected so that plant materials, fencing, walkways, archeological features, etc. are damaged or destroyed.

Stripping features from buildings and the site such as wood siding, iron fencing, masonry balustrades; or removing or destroying landscape features, including plant material.

Failing to provide adequate protection of materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of building and site features results.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of building and site features.

Replacing an entire feature of the building or site such as a fence, walkway, or driveway when repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

Using a substitute material for the replacement part that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the building or site feature or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Removing a feature of the building or site that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced feature is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

Introducing a new building or site feature that is out of scale or otherwise inappropriate.

Introducing a new landscape feature or plant material that is visually incompatible with the site or that destroys site patterns or vistas.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Placing parking facilities directly adjacent to historic buildings where automobiles may cause damage to the buildings or landscape features or be intrusive to the building site.

Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.

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.

District/Neighborhood

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings, and streetscape, and landscape features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the district or neighborhood. Such features can include streets, alleys, paving, walkways, street lights, signs, benches, parks and gardens, and trees.

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, and streetscape and landscape features such as a town square comprised of row houses and stores surrounding a communal park or open space.

Protecting and maintaining the historic masonry, wood, and architectural metals which comprise building and streetscape features, through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and reapplication of protective coating systems; and protecting and maintaining landscape features, including plant material.

Protecting buildings, paving, iron fencing, etc. against arson and vandalism before rehabilitation work begins by erecting protective fencing and installing alarm systems that are keyed into local protection agencies.

Evaluating the overall condition of building, streetscape and landscape materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, that is, if repairs to features will be necessary.

Repairing features of the building, streetscape, or landscape by reinforcing the historic materials. Repair will also generally include the replacement in kind or with a compatible substitute material of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of features when there are surviving prototypes such as porch balustrades, paving materials, or streetlight standards.

Replacing in kind an entire feature of the building, streetscape, or landscape that is too deteriorated to repair when the overall form and detailing are still evident using the physical evidence to guide the new work. This could include a storefront, a walkway, or a garden. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Designing and constructing a new feature of the building streetscape, or landscape when the historic feature is completely missing, such as row house steps, a porch, streetlight, or terrace. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the district or neighborhood.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Designing required new parking so that it is as unobtrusive as possible, i.e., on side streets or at the rear of buildings. "Shared" parking should also be planned so that several business' can utilize one parking area as opposed to introducing random, multiple lots.

Designing and constructing new additions to historic buildings when required by the new use. New work should be compatible with the historic character of the district or neighborhood in terms of size, scale, design, material, color, and texture.

Removing nonsignificant buildings, additions, or streetscape and landscape features which detract from the historic character of the district or the neighborhood.

Not Recommended:

Removing or radically changing those features of the district or neighborhood which are important in defining the overall historic character so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Destroying streetscape and landscape features by widening existing streets, changing paving material, or introducing inappropriately located new streets or parking lots.

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

Failing to provide adequate protection of materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of building, streetscape, and landscape feature results.

Permitting buildings to remain unprotected so that windows are broken; and interior features are damaged.

Stripping features from buildings or the streetscape such as wood siding, iron fencing, or terra cotta balusters; or removing or destroying landscape features, including plant material.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of building, streetscape, and landscape features.

Replacing an entire feature of the building, streetscape, or landscape such as a porch, walkway, or streetlight, when repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

Using a substitute material for the replacement part that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the building, streetscape, or landscape feature or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Removing a feature of the building, streetscape, or landscape that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced feature is based on insufficient historical, pictorial and physical documentation.

Introducing a new building, streetscape or landscape feature that is out of scale or otherwise inappropriate to the setting's historic character, e.g., replacing picket fencing with chain link fencing.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Placing parking facilities directly adjacent to historic buildings which cause the removal of historic plantings, relocation of paths and walkways, or blocking of alleys.

Introducing new construction into historic districts that is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the district or neighborhood.

Removing a historic building, building feature, or landscape or streetscape feature that is important in defining the overall historic character of the district or the neighborhood.

D. FINDINGS:

1. The Minnehaha Park Historic District is on the National Register of Historic Places and locally designated as a historic district.
2. The proposed new structure is located in the Wabun Picnic Area which is a distinct area of the Minnehaha Park, located in the east portion of the park to the south of East 46th Street and north of the Minnesota Soldiers Home.
3. The proposed changes, which include intensifying the use of Wabun Picnic Area, are consistent with the active recreation pattern established in the 1920s with the auto tourist camp and the subsequent picnicking area.
4. The proposed design of the restroom and mechanical building is consistent with color and materials found in other structures in the district, including the red asphalt roof and beige exterior.
5. The proposed design of the building is based on a similar park shelter in Beard's Plaisance, a park on the west side of Lake Harriet. While this site is not in close proximity to Minnehaha Fall Park, there is a historical, system wide connection between Beard's Plaisance and Minnehaha Falls Park.
6. The building placement is in a similar location as the prior structure which was constructed in the 1950s and is consistent with the development pattern in the Wabun Picnic Area for the last 50 years.
7. Construction of the restroom and mechanical structure would not impair the historic quality of the Minnehaha Park Historic District.

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the HPC adopt the staff findings and **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness, subject to the following conditions:

1. Future improvements in the Minnehaha Park Historic District are reviewed by CPED – Preservation and, when appropriate, the Heritage Preservation Commission,
2. Final drawings including plans, elevations and details shall be reviewed and approved by CPED-Planning staff.

**Excerpt from the
Heritage Preservation Commission
MINUTES
Minneapolis Community Planning & Economic Development (CPED)
Planning Division
350 South Fifth Street, Room 210
Minneapolis MN 55415
612-673-2597 Phone**

MEMORANDUM

To: Jack Byers, Planning Supervisor
Community Planning

Barb Sporlein, Planning Director
Community Planning & Economic Development Planning Division

SUBJECT: Heritage Preservation Commission decisions of November 6, 2007

Commissioners Present: Koski, Crippen, Kelly, Larsen, Messenger, Ollendorf and Selchow.

Not Present: Commissioner Anderson, Dunn and Lee

3. 4655 East 46th Street (Minnehaha Park Historic District) < Ward 12 (Staff: Molly McCartney)

Commissioner Ollendorf: The proposed new shelter will resemble the newly installed mini shelters, what ever they're called, picnic areas. Did the HPC staff approve the design of the picnic area shelters?

Staff Molly McCartney: Yes, this is one of the open ... the smaller shelters, that I have on the overhead, they all have similar. The proposed restroom is octagonal and I think this is more of a six sided structure. So it has a similar shape, but not the same shape. The four other structures, the open park shelters were not reviewed by staff. The particulars of working in a large city with many permits coming through this is a district not very well known and I think maybe some city staff approved it mistakenly. But with that I think some of the findings that were made for the restroom could be made for the other structures as well.

Commissioner Ollendorf: In your first page your report description that talks about the Minnehaha inaudible ...1949 and the Longfellow house in 1906, can you point out on the plan...master plan where those are located in relation to this proposed shelter?

Staff Molly McCartney: Chair Koski, Commissioner Ollendorf, this plan, the color rendering is just of the *Wabun* Area, so it's a very small area. Here is East 46th Street. This is the service road that would take you to the Minnesota Soldier's Home. So, most of the park, a large chunk of the park is to the West and Southwest of here. So, again, here's *Wabun*, here's where 46 comes across, here's the Minnesota Soldier's Home. The falls are right about here, and the Princess Depot and

the John Steven's House...so the Princess Depot is here, the Steven's House is here. The land bridge on Longfellow, I think is right here. The John Steven's House and Longfellow House was not the original location of those. Historic Resources, the Steven's House originally was located in St. Anthony and moved to the park over 100 years ago. So there's kind of an eclectic group of architectural styles that are represented in the park.

Commissioner Larsen: Are the picnic shelters that are going up ...are they matching, the materials of the picnic shelters matching the materials of the proposed structure? And I assume it's a split face block?

Staff Molly McCartney: Yes, so that block would be on that knee wall area and then the beige colored lap siding which I don't have a sample of and then the red asphalt shingles which is really ... would be consistent with the refectory building and the pavilion, so it would have some commonality with other structures in the park.

Commissioner Crippen: Related questions. The lap siding that you're recommending approval of, are you seeing that tying to the two houses, because, I have two questions. One is what's your thinking on cement fiber as apposed to natural wood siding, but also, if memory serves, the park structures down by the falls are stucco, not lap siding, so I'm wondering what your thoughts are on that.

Staff Molly McCartney: Commission Crippen and Chair Koski, you are correct, the refectory is a stucco, has stucco exterior. The open air pavilion I think is just a wood structure with that red asphalt shingles, I don't think it's covered in stucco, or cement. It's not lap siding either. While the materials are not the same as those structures, they do have similar...the colors, some of the materials are similar. I guess some of the lap siding would speak to the residential structures in the district as well as the surrounding neighboring community. The applicants from the Park Board can maybe speak to that.

Commissioner Crippen: Do we have history of approving cement fiber instead of wood for lap siding? Either staff or Commissioners I'm wondering.

Commissioner Koski: In some residential districts I know that we have.

Commissioner Kelley: Ms. McCartney, I understand that the materials at least will match among the Wabun Area, so I'm going to address my question to the scale. My memory, it's been many years, but of the Wabun Area wasn't that it was an extremely large place, and this seems to be quite a good sized building, and I wonder if you happen to know what they consider the caring capacity of that part of the park?

Staff Molly McCartney: A little bit of information about the proposed structure is from what the applicants have told me is that the smaller open park structures. These smaller ones, have a capacity of 50 persons and that these larger ones have a capacity of 250 each. I think that the pool mechanical room and restroom would not have that...not be able to have that many people, but that gives a good, a general, if the park is at full capacity, that's a lot of extra people.

Commissioner Ollendorf: I find it a bit intriguing that this District is on the National Register of Historic Places, listed since 1969 and if I remember what you said earlier correctly, that the original shelters were put up in the 50's? Yeah, so, the appearance of those didn't detract from the integrity enough to cause it not to be listed, but I find myself now, concerned and interested in the Section

106 process, what the SHPO's comments on this design may be, or have been, and that's not included in our packet. I don't know if you have received any communication from them, or...

Staff Molly McCartney: Chair Koski and Commissioner Ollendorf, from what I understand the Section 106 was not done, or maybe not even required for this work since the Park Board did not use any federal funds that would have triggered the 106 review. I do mention a little bit about ... that the application does not address any archeological resources either. The original ... the designation from 1969 doesn't even mention the Wabun Park Area. It does mention other particular areas such as Camp Cold Water and the actual falls themselves. We have a lot of good information about when the...when highway 55 was re-routed and then the work done around that and the LRT line, so, Wabun is kind of a there's just not a lot of good information out there. The 1992 master plan does specifically address Wabun and does talk a little bit about the historic...the history of that site, but that's probably as much ... that's what I could find with in my staff resources and time. I'm sure the applicants can speak to some of those maybe state related questions...SHPO questions.

Commissioner Koski: Molly, I'm curious, if there are specific guidelines for this district?

Staff Molly McCartney: Chair Koski, there are not specific.

Commissioner Koski: So you are using the Secretary of Interior's guidelines and standards?

Staff Molly McCartney: Yes, so, the guidelines that we used were the Secretary of Interior's standards for rehabilitation for building sites as well as district and yes, those are the two.

Commissioner Koski: I know you've not been working with the HPC for all that long, so your institutional memory doesn't go back that far, but in other districts that are governed by the national standards rather than their own district guidelines, is there an example where we have approved split faced concrete block construction?

Staff Molly McCartney: Chair Koski, I'm going to actually ask Jack Byers, Supervisor as well to recollect. I'm thinking.

Commissioner Koski: Mr. Byers.

Staff Supervisor Jack Byers: Mr. Chair and Commissioners, I would say that there is probably Commissioners who have probably a better institutional memory or recollection of that. I don't.

Commissioner Koski: Okay, thank you. I'm also concerned about the wood lap siding since there are no specific...I mean we have very little architectural fabric to look to here, and the one that I'm familiar with is the refectory and maybe some of the bridges. The refectory is obviously stucco construction and mission style, perhaps. But very solid and this is quite a departure from that, so it gives me a little bit of pause how we justify approval of this particular design or if we want to go ahead and maybe institute some new standards that the Park Board can look to when they add other considerable structures. I'm also looking at the site plan and I'm not sure if I'm reading it correctly, but is there a golf course? Going in, next to these structures?

Staff Molly McCartney: Chair Koski, There is a disc golf course...

-- TAPE BROKE --

Commissioner Koski: I guess the landmark as the landscape we should be looking at that and not just the few structures we are putting on top of it. Do you know how extensive the ground work is there?

Staff Molly McCartney: There is work going on as far as an entrance to the new parking area and I don't have an existing site plan. I apologize.

Commissioner Koski: Will we have a chance to review that at some point?

Staff Molly McCartney: Right now, what's coming through is just...it's just the building. From what I understand the site plan has been approved by the city, which includes the parking, the rain gardens and the other structures.

Commissioner Koski: Okay.

Staff Molly McCartney: So we can comment and speak to it, but the application tonight is for the single structure.

Commissioner Koski: Well, I guess we're thankful for that. Any other questions of staff? This is a public hearing is there anybody else that would like to speak to this application?

Andy Lesch: Good evening I'm Andy Lesch, I'm with Minneapolis Park Board Planning Department, I'm the project manager for the Wabun picnic renovation project. I'm here to answer any questions you may have. There was a question before about the holding capacity of the area. Its been a group picnic area since 1956 and there has been seating there for 1,000 persons, and we're intending to renovate the park to that same capacity. Not really to go beyond that. We think that is a comfortable number for the park. Previously there was seating for maybe 60 underneath the old covered shelter with primarily a restroom facility which was sorely outdated with what are needs were to have covered group picnic areas for the city and usage of the park had fallen off to maybe a third of it's capacity over the last ten years of so, so it was poorly, I guess it was badly delapated and a long time in coming to get it renovated, so we did have public meetings last fall in October. We had a public meeting in the neighborhood and well received. People liked the improvements and they selected this shelter style and shape over other traditional hip roof or gable roofs that we had shown them and we had a public hearing November 1st in front of our board. Also well received by the Board. It was also shown at a neighborhood last May or June for the 46th Avenue redesign we had a public meeting for that as well, so...the shape of the building we have an octagonal shape for the larger shelter and hexagonal shape for the smaller shelter and went for that design as we thought the portions were much better given the height restrictions that we have within the river setback areas, 35 feet max, and this building is at 28 feet with a cupola. Which isn't shown on the photographs there because we haven't been at that stage yet. We're using the red roof single materials, typical of the other buildings in Minnehaha Park and also you see the red roofs on the four facilities right below us at the lock and dam area across the way. You also see the red roofs in the neighboring Soldier's Home area.

Commissioner Koski: We have a couple of questions for you if you're willing to entertain them?

Mr. Lesch: Yes,

Commissioner Kelley: Actually I just wanted to address my fellow Commissioners, I expressed some concerns about the scale of the project before, but given that this is going to be a intended for 1,000 people, I think the scale of the bathrooms is quite appropriate and I remember that the

existing structures were often unequal to the task for large groups. It's a long history of that. The other thing that I wanted to mention is that, with regard to the unity of style within Minnehaha Park, most of the park, the main falls area and the pavilion area and so on is separated from the Wabun Area by a great gorge. They essentially kind of form two different locuses or loci for the park and it seems like ... I'm not as concerned with it matching up with the refectory building. What would be nice if things kind of tied with the WPA construction of stairways and so on that are in that area, and I think that perhaps maybe the siding does at least in some way tie in with that. But I'm sorry I don't have any questions for you I just wanted to bring those things up.

Commissioner Koski: We'll try to remember those during our discussion period at the end, or you can remind us again.

Commissioner Ollendorf: Okay, so no federal funding for this, but I'm still interested in if any consultations occurred with the SHPO, because it is part of the National Register District.

Mr. Lesch: No they have not.

Commissioner Ollendorf: Any intentions to?

Mr. Lesch: At this point, if it's not required, I'd say no. Mr. Chair, if I could address, there was a questions earlier that I failed to address, was, you asked about a change in typography out there? The upper tier where the Wabun picnic area is is relatively flat and we're not really changing the grade. We have a new entrance road in there which reuses the historic entrance which was ... used to be a gravel parking lot there in 1956 when we first got the property from the tourist camp, when it was converted over, so we're actually re-opening, what was a former entrance into the park. We've been doing that for sight line reasons, to bring people up into the park. Right now you come off the old Veterans Soldier's Home Road, actually, without any view of the park except to entering to see cars in the parking lot, so it's...for very strong esthetic and safety reasons we're making that shift in the service drive.

Commissioner Koski: Was your question answered Commissioner Ollendorf?

Commissioner Ollendorf: Yes.

Commissioner Larsen: At what point in the process did you become aware that you needed HPC approvals?

Mr. Lesch: About six weeks ago.

Commissioner Larsen: Are there any other items that relate to this project that have yet to be approved that you'll be bringing before us?

Mr. Lesch: Not that I'm aware of.

Commissioner Larsen: This is the last item?

Mr. Lesch: I believe it is.

Commissioner Larsen: Thank you.

Commissioner Crippen: This is a follow up to Commissioner Larsen. You were I assume aware from the beginning of the project even before the master plan that this was an Historic District, I presume.

Mr. Lesch: I was not.

Commissioner Crippen: Okay. Thanks.

Commissioner Ollendorf: I have a couple of questions left. Back to the Historic District issue, the property, the Wabun property is in the Minnehaha Park Historic District as well as part of the Grand Rounds Park System. I'm trying to take a big picture approach here, do we know anything about the periods of significance of those two district designations and how does the period of Historical significance play into your whole design process, if at all?

Mr. Lesch: I believe that period significance relates to the WPA improvements that were made in the park in the 1930s and 40s. None of those are relevant in the area that we are working on right now. Since the last improvements were made there in 1956. Since we didn't have those WPA structures to reference or even within view of this area, we did not try to mimic or imitate those, but rather use materials and designs that were complimentary to the park and modernizing our needs for the park.

Commissioner Ollendorf: Inaudible.

Mr. Lesch: I don't know the period of significance for the entire parkway. There WPA structures along this stream within the parkway that we have worked on, either modified or removed and worked with SHPO because those were federally funded improvements and I'm aware of those and there are bridge structures along the parkway that are of that period of significance as well.

Commissioner Ollendorf: Inaudible.

Mr. Lesch: This area is primarily blocked by it's typography of the slope coming off the Ford Bridge. It's really enclosed with in that area.

Commissioner Ollendorf: Inaudible.

Mr. Lesch: This building has a small, what you might call a sub-floor, it's six feet deep and that's to accommodate the pool filter so that it can gradually flow away from the wading pool, other than that they're simply frost footings. So there isn't really a basement area. It's a small room that will house the pumps and filters to that.

Commissioner Ollendorf: T

Mr. Lesch: No it's not, it is a different shape. We looked at renovating the old building and it basically would have doubled its foot print of that building in order to get up to our modern restroom needs. They were sorely lacking before, so, we looked at the cost of that comparing to creating new structures that would be complimentary to the other buildings and thought this was the appropriate way to go. The grades really have remained unchanged other than just to accommodate water flow and to accommodate the new porous pavement. (inaudible)

Commissioner Kelley: You did point out that there is no WPA era construction in view of this site and I was thinking of the Soldier's Home and I'm also...it's been a long time since I've been there,

but within view of the site are the Soldier's Home...Minnesota Veterans Home buildings are they modern or are they the old ones.

Mr. Lesch: Commissioner, within view of this area, they are both modern and old. They have their I think it's a 70's vintage building they're talking about removing now. A later renovation we have been an on going relationship and review with the planning staff and the management at the Minnesota Veteran's Home the shelters that we're proposing are actually very much like the one they had proposed as a historic recreation on their bluff overlooking the lock and dam, which had been suggested (inaudible) at SHPO. So they were pleased to see that actually it looked a lot like what they were trying to do but couldn't afford.

Commissioner Koski: I think those were all the questions that we have for you. Thank you for answering them. This is a public hearing, is there anybody who wishes to speak to this item? Is there anyone else who wants to say anything in support of or against? I'm closing the public hearing then. Commissioners...

Commissioner Ollendorf: Can we request or require an archeological survey? As a condition?

Commissioner Koski: I don't see why not. That's my opinion, but, Commissioners? I mean it sounds like it may be more of a legal issue.

Commissioner Ollendorf: Inaudible.

Commissioner Koski: But we require mitigation for other projects, for demolition, for changes of landscape and ...

Commissioner Ollendorf: Inaudible.

Commissioner Koski: So it's the first half of the process. Mr. Byers.

Staff Supervisor, Mr. Byers: We just need it into the mic.

Commissioner Ollendorf: I'm sorry, I was just asking procedurally if it's possible for us to require an archeological survey in the foot print of the new impacts.

Commissioner Koski: I don't know if anybody wants to take action on this. I'm, or course, distraught that the project has proceeded to a point where we are really only reviewing one structure and I think there are several elements, pathways, view sheds, entrances, materials, ground surfaces, that need to be considered as part of this landmark. The entire landscape is the landmark. I also am convinced that the design, even though it's gone through a community process, and I appreciate how difficult that is on its own, it has not gone through with any input from staff or the HPC Commissioners. I also don't see any research into the architecture of the area, drawing any influence other than maybe a red roof, maybe a beige wall. I'm also...I could not support the use of split concrete block in a historic district unless there was precedence for it. None has been shown here. I...given the fact that the roof is not residential in any way. The massing is...does not convey any kind of residential use. The use of wood lap siding seems, frankly quite odd, so I would wonder if stucco is more appropriate in that regard, but I'm quite frankly, not willing to redesign the project here this evening, through conditioning and I just simply would deny the C of A. So, I'll make a motion that we deny the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Commissioner Selchow: I'll second that.

Commissioner Koski: Any other discussion? All in favor of the motion say "Aye": Aye . Opposed?
"Nay": Nay. Abstentions? The motion carries and the C of A is denied.