

Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission

April 14, 2009, Room 317 City Hall

Staff: Aaron Hanauer

Planning Supervisor: Jack Byers

Date of Appeal: June 4, 2009

ITEM SUMMARY (3 Applications)

(BZH 25780)

Address: 1013 University Avenue SE, J.A. and L.R. Lovejoy House – Ward 3

Description: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition of an Historic Resource

Action: **Adopt** staff findings and **approve** the demolition application of the property at 1013 University Avenue SE with the following condition:

1. The applicant shall provide the opportunity for a salvage organization to bid on the salvage of materials from the structure.

(BZH 25781)

Address: 1019 University Avenue SE, Pi Beta Phi Sorority House – Greek Letter Chapter House Historic District, Ward 3

Description: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition of the Pi Beta Phi Sorority House.

Action: **Adopt** staff findings and **deny** the demolition application of the property at 1019 University Avenue S.E.

(BZH 25782)

Address: 1013-1019 University Avenue SE – Greek Letter Chapter House Historic District, Ward 3

Description: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed new construction of a 23-unit apartment building.

Action: **Adopt** staff findings and **deny** the Certificate of Appropriateness application for new construction at 1013-1019 University Avenue S.E

TRANSCRIPTION

(BZH 25780)

Address: 1013 University Avenue SE, J.A. and L.R. Lovejoy House – Ward 3

Chair Larsen: Alright, we've got the 1019 University Southeast Pi Beta Phi Sorority House, Greek Letter Chapter House Historic District, Ward 3, Staff Aaron Hanauer. Aaron, I see that you are presenting, we've got the three items before us regarding the same project and in trying to keep things moving along in as relative diligent speed as

we can, let's get the overview and let's try to get to the heart of the matter and get to the testimony so we make sure we know what's going on. Commissioner Crippen?

Commissioner Crippen: Yes, I should have said something earlier. I was wondering why we didn't deal with both demolitions at the same time before getting to, why we jumped into construction and then to the demolition. Maybe there's a quick answer? Or can we just deal with the two demolitions in the manner that you just suggested and then if we need to we talk about construction?

Chair Larsen: I think we can do that, is that acceptable to the applicant to talk about the two demolitions and then move to the new construction? Ok, alright, then we'll do that. Let's start with number 6 first.

Staff Hanauer: The 1019 proposal is a 23-unit apartment building. You've seen the findings for the necessity of a demolition. The applicant hasn't stated it's an unsafe or dangerous condition. For reasonable alternatives, the applicant has not stated that there are not reasonable alternatives but that the property is functionally obsolete. For the significance, it is a contributing structure to the Greek Letter Chapter House Historic District. Here's a floor plan that Mr. Freund, the property manager, has given staff to show the small room sizes, small bedroom sizes, of the place. Going back to the significance, even though it's not part of the Fraternity Row, it's off the row, still doesn't reduce the significance of the property. Getting into the particular significance of this property, it's one of the earliest sororities, that's in Appendix C 22 and 23. It's the only Prairie School architectural style sorority or fraternity in that district as shown in the AIA guide. It was designed by two pioneering female architects and possible significance at an individual level. Integrity, the applicant says only location is there. The designation study has stated that it has good integrity, that was 2003. Staff felt the integrity was fully there also. I can go into detail on the design and materials that are in the report, if you have questions. That last part for the findings, the economic value and usefulness. Hennepin County assessor stated it as \$486,000. Mr. Freund purchased this property in 1999 for \$484,000 and the estimated gut and rehab as stated by the applicant is \$435,000. Finally, before wrapping up, the public comments. The Marcy Holmes neighborhood association stated that if the commission sees demolition as the only appropriate measure they support the new construction. The comprehensive plan point out two policies that promote the retention and encouraging the adaptive reuse of a property if possible. Staff, saw that there is three possibilities that weren't looked at, such as to renovate and restore the property, to return the interior to a chapter house or co-housing, or remodel to increase the size of the rooms or create separate housing units in order to retain the property.

Chair Larsen: Ok, questions of staff ... Commissioner Harrison, do you have a question?

Staff Byers: I might suggest that you allow Aaron to talk about the two properties and what the larger proposal is so that you're not, you have to deal with it piecemeal, but you have to understand the larger ...

Chair Larsen: Ok, so if we have him present on the other property and then ... sure, that would be great.

Staff Hanauer: This is 1013, the J.A. & L.R. Lovejoy House, a two story Italianate home built in 1875. It's located not in the district, but staff felt that this was an historic resource due to its age and the architectural style that was there and possibly could have been behind the materials that have covered it up. Definitely this property needs work. It's in bad shape, the applicant has, at staff's request, provided a structural report. It detailed the amount of work that needs to be done and from these exterior images that's evident. Also the interior images show that it is structurally compromised. For the significance of this property, I mention the age, 1875 was the circa date in the designation study. Staff wasn't sure of that circa date and thought there was a chance it could have been earlier, however in research staff is more confident in the circa 1875 date. The property would have been, staff believes would have been shown on this block on this map. But that wasn't the case. In a map from 1885 it is located there. The architectural style, due to its being compromised and lacking integrity did not believe it had potential for being designated and was another reason why staff is recommending approval of the demolition of this property with conditions. The conditions for this are that a photographic recordation of the property shall be prepared and submitted to the staff as in accordance with the guidelines of the Minnesota Historical Property Record and that the recordation shall include all interior and exterior spaces including outbuildings and site design. Two, the applicant shall provide the opportunity for a salvage organization to bid on the salvage of materials from the structure; and

three, final demolition permit will not be issued until necessary land use approvals for the new construction are granted.

Chair Larsen: Any questions before we move on to the next one? Let's see the plan for the new construction.

Staff Hanauer: Would you like me to go through this report at this time?

Chair Larsen: Yes.

Staff Hanauer: The proposal is a four-story, 23-unit building with Bravissi block and stucco panels. For the findings for the Certificate of Appropriateness for this new construction, as is stated in the application, should not impair the district, or the landmark, and must make sure it is consistent with the guidelines of the district, and details consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's rehabilitation standards. For the reasons stated in the staff report, this proposal would create the need for the demolition or a contributing structure, therefore the first finding, the impact to a landmark, staff did not feel could be met. The impact to the district, 1019, the Pi Beta Phi Sorority House, is a contributing structure. Additional details: it being one of the earliest sorority houses and the only example of a Prairie School, and proximity to two contributing structures off the row. Staff did not believe it could meet that second finding, not impacting the district. I highlighted in here that staff did not believe it met 5 of the guidelines for new construction and one for the parking. I'll just briefly highlight the guidelines that staff didn't feel it met. The placement and orientation, which is Guideline A. If there's questions, let me know. Guideline B, the scale, size, height, massing shall be consistent with those properties around, those historic properties around, staff did not feel it met that. Guideline C is the roof pitch or flat roofs should be compatible with historic buildings in adjacent streetscape. All rows should have appropriate detail parapets or cornices. I think I'll go back to the scale, size and massing. From this, the rhythm of those modest sized homes, staff didn't feel was consistent. For the roof, at the eave it is 52-ft from the elevation provided from ground to the bottom of the eave. Compared to the neighboring properties, it's about 27 feet, so the height of the roof is the reason staff didn't feel it met that guideline. Guideline D is the openings should be compatible with the adjacent historic buildings in their type, size, alignment, and proportion. There is no other sorority or fraternity that has a front facing garage, and that was an opening that staff did not feel could be supported and it would also detract from pedestrian entrance for these houses as well as a gathering space for a fraternity or sorority. For Guideline B, the parking, there wasn't enough information provided to support or to see it being in compliance with that guideline. Finally, is this consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and just to emphasize what it says here in those standards: "A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment. The applicant has not demonstrated that this property cannot be salvaged, that being 1019, so therefore staff did not believe the proposal met that finding, for being consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Public Comments: That letter from Marcy Holmes carries throughout, and is shown in all applications. I want to point out from that letter that if the Commission sees demolition of 1019 and 1013 as the only appropriate measures then the neighborhood supports the new construction.

Chair Larsen: I think we have a question.

Commissioner Crippen: Thank you, yes, a question about the standards for new construction, or the guidelines for new construction with the historic district. A lot of the new construction guidelines talk about adjacent or related historic buildings and I was wondering does that really apply in the non-contiguous part of the district? What are your thoughts on that?

Staff Hanauer: Chair Larsen and Commissioner Crippen, yes that thought came up. There are at least two reasons for those guidelines needing to be applied. One, the proximity to the other historic properties that are nearby. Two, the properties that are off the row were considered to be modest sized homes that fit in with the character that they were built in and to be consistent with that type of development staff thought it was appropriate to apply those guidelines.

Chair Larsen: Any other questions? Ok, let's see here, is there anything more that you want to talk about regarding this particular application, the new construction?

Staff Hanauer: Not at this time.

Chair Larsen: Ok, then I think I'm inclined to open up the public hearing on the demolition of 1019 (tape gap). So then we will open up the public hearing for our item #4.

Mark Freund: May I give a request? Could we speak to 1013 and then 1019?

Chair Larsen: Sure, be happy to. Alright, so we'll open up the public hearing regarding 1013 University Avenue SE, the J.A. and R.J. Lovejoy House. Please step forward. If you wish to speak, please state your name for the record, and your address.

Mark Freund: Hi, I'm Mark Freund, I'm the owner of 1013 University Avenue SE. I am pleased that staff is recommending to approve the demolition of the property and I will show some more pictures of the property. I would request, however, that the three condition, conditions 1 and 3, be removed. One, being a photographic recordation of the property shall be prepared and submitted to staff that is in accordance with the guidelines of the Minnesota Historic Property Record. I have many more pictures than were submitted. There is nothing to see, and I want to show those to you. I'll start with the exterior, you've seen some of that. There's more, we've got animals living up in here. When I bought 1019 actually in 2005, and I do apologize for blurting out that correction, May of 2005. The previous owner has had animals living in there the entire time that I've been ... and so those are the exterior pictures that I do have.

Chair Larsen: Is it my understanding that they had undergone a renovation process that kind of went awry?

Mark Freund: The previous owner was bootlegging renovations. He was just doing it on his own, there was nothing looked at or approved, and when he realized he got in over his head he started looking for options. The first thing he did was try to get the fraternity who was in 1019 University. At that time he talked to the fraternity to see if they had interest in buying the property and they walked through and couldn't believe what they saw. And even though that was the case they did ask as well if the license, they had let the license go 10 years earlier and rooming house licenses are unsupported. I don't know the exact term, but once it's gone, it's gone. And so they had no interest, so then his next call was to me. And so here are some more pictures. This is the sweeping Gone With The Wind style staircase. He had removed all of the plaster from the walls and ceilings. This is more of that staircase. This is some of the second floor demo. This is more just throughout the whole place. I asked him when I walked through, why, I mean I've bought a lot of distressed properties, all of my properties were distressed when I bought them and I've done a lot to save them. That's what I do. I asked him why, and he told me he saved a lot of money with the electricians because he had to rewire and we do have an electrician here to speak if anybody has a question of the condition when I bought it. I did mention at the time that the beautiful sweeping staircase, modern sheetrock, you are going to have to get plaster, so he really kind of shot himself in the foot. But this is the whole house. This is up on 3rd floor where the animals have been living up in the roof. This is their droppings and whatnot, and that's the inside of that window. I went back to take a few more pictures. This is the bathroom and it's wallpapered with dictionary because one of the things that wasn't in the staff report and I don't think it's real important because they're recommending the demolition, is for 10 years this was a daycare. And it's not in there at all. And it was licensed, it was the Little Haven Daycare. This is another ...

Chair Larsen: Thank you, I think we get the idea.

Mark Freund: Yeah, and then finally I wanted to have you see the basement with these shores that are just kind of sporadically placed on top of blocks, broken blocks like that one, on wood, on top of broken blocks. I didn't until I went back just a couple days ago to take a picture, I didn't realize that there's a shore above these shores on the first floor holding the 2nd, so you have the temporary shores holding up the first and then this one holding up the second. And this is actually in that room that I just showed you, this one here, where he'd torn all kind of stuff off the walls. For that reason, because of this, I was hoping that it's obvious with all the rules and regulations in the city of Minneapolis that there's much more process to go through with whatever I end up putting on that property. This property is excessively dangerous and I'd like permission to demolish the property and make the site safe and not be

burdened with photographic evidence and Number 3 which is the final approvals of what is going to go on that site. There is plenty of process to go through, and I did point out I kind of laughed when I did this because it's kind of like the Looney Tunes cartoons where since I put the orange placards on for this meeting I've had two break-ins. I had the property since January of 08, vacant the entire time, I own one next door and I have some lights on timers, the orange placards called attention to the property and now I'm bailing that as well. That's all I have for 1013.

Chair Larsen: As far as you recommending that we just deal with this ...

Staff Byers: Chair and Commissioners, it's certainly as you see fit. You can either hold three hearings and make three decisions or you can hold a hearing, make a decision, hold a hearing, make a decision. You can either do it sequentially or cumulatively.

Chair Larsen: Commissioners, what's your pleasure? Alright, so I think we have a recommendation to take testimony for this particular application, close the public hearing, make a decision ... ok. So we'll talk just about this particular property at the moment. Is there anybody else that wishes to speak either for or against this application, please step forward.

Mark Freund: I did have one other point. On number 2 I'm Mr. Green, so that was already in the works as far as looking to salvage anything that we can in there.

Chair Larsen: Thank you.

Mike Crowe: My name's Mike Crowe, I'm president of Crowe Construction Management and the only comment I have on this building is I've been doing this now for 40 years. It's starting to get scary how many years I've been doing it, and this is the first building, and I've been in thousands of buildings, and this is the first building after going in the basement and looking how it's propped up I wouldn't go back in the building. So whatever they could do to help it on that, this building's going down whether it's approved or not, it's going down. Half the foundation is not even supporting the building.

Chair Larsen: Thank you, is there anybody else that wishes to speak either for or against this application? Seeing none, we'll close the public hearing. Commissioners, what's your pleasure?

Commissioner Lemmon: Boy, it's a hard one and I know we don't like to take down buildings but I am going to make a motion to adopt staff findings and approve the demolition application for the property at 1013 University Avenue SE. I am going to also make the following modifications to the conditions. I do agree that we can strike item number 1, there is nothing that would be documented or necessary to be put on file as I can see it. I think that all of the documentation and information already was probably gleaned from the study previously on that district. Item number 2 I think we can leave as is. I appreciate that you are willing to do that. And item number 3, that's always a difficult one. We don't like to have empty lots, but I think that in this particular case, particularly because there's something coming forward with a request for something greater and we have the next two proposals, I'm torn on number 3.

Chair Larsen: May I make a comment? I think I would be more concerned if this particular property was in a historic district. Where we don't have a choice. If we let it be torn down and it's in a historic district, we really have lost it. That said, if it's allowed to be torn down and nothing happens with the other project then he would be able to follow regular city guidelines and build a new home on the property and there would be no review, but I think there would be even no review even if we wouldn't let it be torn down.

Commissioner Lemmon: That said, I will also strike item number 3.

Chair Larsen: Ok, so we have a motion. Is there a second to that motion?

Commissioner Kelley: I'll make a second to that motion.

Chair Larsen: Alright, so we've got a motion to adopt staff findings and approve a demolition application for the property at 1013 University Avenue SE with one condition, that the applicant shall provide the opportunity for a salvage organization to bid on the salvage of materials from the structure. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion, we'll call the roll.

Clerk: Commissioner Lackovic?

Commissioner Lackovic: Aye.

Clerk: Anderson?

Commissioner Anderson: Aye.

Clerk: Crippen?

Commissioner Crippen: Aye.

Clerk: Larsen?

Chair Larsen: Aye.

Clerk: Lemmon?

Commissioner Lemmon: Aye.

Clerk: Harrison?

Commissioner Harrison: Aye.

Clerk: Mack?

Commissioner Mack: Aye.

Clerk: Kelley?

Commissioner Kelley: Aye.

Chair Larsen: Ok, that motion carries. So that property will be able to be removed and hopefully correcting an unsafe condition, very unsafe condition.

(BZH 25781)

ITEM SUMMARY

- Address:** 1019 University Avenue SE, Pi Beta Phi Sorority House – Greek Letter Chapter House Historic District, Ward 3
- Description:** Application for Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition of the Pi Beta Phi Sorority House.
- Action:** **Adopt** staff findings and **deny** the demolition application of the property at 1019 University Avenue S.E.

TRANSCRIPTION

Chair Larsen: OK, so we're going to be opening up the public hearing on item #4 which is the 1019 University Avenue SE designated property, the Pi Beta Phi Sorority House. Mr. Freund, am I pronouncing that correctly? How do you pronounce your name?

Mark Freund: "Froynd"

Chair Larsen: Freund, thank you.

Mark Freund: I wanted to start my presentation with just a few housecleaning issues I guess. Repeatedly through this it talks about a 16-room rooming house. Here's my rental license, it's a 17-room rooming house and it's never been anything other than that. Housecleaning, as I said, and the other part is it talks about a 24-unit building and it is a 23-unit building, so I just wanted to get those things out of the way. I wanted to make a statement of 1019 University Avenue SE was built originally for the Pi Beta Phi Sorority in 1916 and 12 years later they moved to their current location which they are still at. They commissioned 1109 5th Street SE and they've been there 81 years, since 1928. Aside from the 12 years that Pi Beta Phi was in 1019 University Avenue SE, Delta Upsilon was there briefly in either 2002 or 2003 and then from 2005-2008 when I took over the building I got the Kappa Alpha Phi fraternity in there for 3 years, so we've had 16 years of a 93 year history where it was actually ever participating in the Greek-dom, I don't know what to say on that one. I do have a couple witnesses that are going to speak, and one of them is Clarence Knox who is an alumni from that chapter of Kappa Alpha Phi, and he's going to speak to some of the truths of that house and why they ended up having to leave and whatnot, but I'll continue. One other thing that I need to address is I really struggled with how I was going to handle this, but there are some things in here, Aaron has worked with me and we've had many communications over these many months, and has been very resistant to the thought of taking this house down, which was not my first choice. That being said, I'll get into some more of that. As I was reading the staff findings, once I was made aware of Marion Alice Parker and her architecture of this house, I poured myself literally for months into studying Prairie School architecture, Purcell and Elmslie, which is their firm, and Marion Alice Parker specifically, and I do want to source myself. And my sources are the University of Minnesota library's northwest architectural archives, Prairie School Traveler, the Minneapolis Institute of Art, Nicole Watson who I've cited and who is a scholar who speaks as Marion Alice Parker (unclear), Mark Haminson who has an incredibly useful organic website that covers Prairie School and more precisely Purcell and Elmslie and all the people who work in their offices, and then the collection of William Grey Purcell papers which is located at the Northwest Architecture archives. His pair of biographies, there's a little statement here, a prolific writer, William Grey Purcell left a massive body of manuscripts articulating the work of the firm, their design intentions and experience of getting through the work. In particular Purcell developed a commission by commission account of Purcell Elmslie architects that he calls the pair of biographies. The reason that I bring this up is that staff findings, I had provided a list of 29 properties of which 13 are in Minneapolis, have credited either Marion Alice Parker as their architect or a draft person and staff says that they could find nothing of that so I decided that I would use William Grey Purcell's own words and these pair of biographies as well as Nicole Watson's research on these properties. I did not pull these properties out of a hat. Had I done that, the Dr. Oscar Owre house would have definitely, in the Lake of the Isle, have been on that list because it most resembles 1019 University out of all the properties. Here's the Henry Gooseman residence, 2532 Pillsbury Ave S, Marion Alice Parker, our lady of the draught, made the drawings and took a lot of pains to do a perfect job, George Fike stayed with every detail of engineering. The house

has a garage basement, one of the very first built-in garages. This is the front elevation, that's the only elevation I've got of that property. We've got the Ed Getsonburger house, 2621 Emerson Ave S, there's a garage where he lists her as one of the working drawings. We've got the Baker residence also in Minneapolis. We've got the Edward L. Powers residence where he mentions Marion Parker did most of the final draughting and tracing ... they ran what Nicole Watson speaks to a very democratic office where every person in the office was involved with only so many projects and it was nice that these pair of biographies actually noted some of these participations of Marion Alice Parker. That being said, four of the properties, the Purcell house being one of them, are National Register properties for the things that Marion was involved in. The Backus House is noted in my findings, in my packet, as we constructed immediately before 1019 University and a lot of what you see here is what you find there also in the Marion Alice Parker house. Fred and Hague developed three properties on Park Lake, you've got the E.S. Hoyt house ...

Chair Larsen: I think we believe you, that there are multiple examples ...

Mark Freund: Well, I'm making sure that I've done my research and I'm not making this up. I just want to make sure that you ...

Chair Larsen: But I think that if you can, in your mind what does the compilation of all these works, how does that apply?

Mark Freund: Well, 1019 University, if it ends up being lost, isn't the only footprint of Marion Alice Parker. If it was the last thing, I can understand fighting tooth and nail, even if it was looking like 1013 University, to try to do something. Getting back to what I began, I kind of went off on a tangent and got ahead of myself a little bit, but I was concerned after all of the research that I have done on this, as I'm reading these findings, I am finding things that in all of those sources that I listed, don't exist. There are statements in here, Ethel Bartholomew is considered one of the first women architects, was given particular praise for her contributions in the kitchen and then we're referenced to Appendix C-9 which I actually did take a magnifying glass to read because if you remember that I read this thoroughly and I really struggle with what I feel I really need to say about this because I wanted to make sure that what I was reading was exactly right because we have that statement in the staff findings that she was praised particularly for the kitchen in this house and then we're brought to C-9 which is really an obscure very tough to read piece. In no where does it state anything about the kitchen in this house, and as I was re-reading it today, I got to about the end of the first paragraph and I thought in reading it word for word I remembered this. My eyes went north and I found, this is an article that was written March 26, 1911, five years before this house was built. And the only thing that it states in there is that she's fond of designing kitchens. And so there are several statements in here of findings of fact by staff referring to appendices where the appendices do not say that. And I want to draw attention to that because my wife was a commissioner in St. Paul for a number of years on the Human Rights Commission. And I know as commissioners you look to staff's findings of fact so that you can base decisions on that, and whoever is coming to speak for or against you take all of that into consideration. This whole process is tainted because I've found a number of these in here and I guess in the zeal to stop this process, to stop this house from going down, if things are going to be embellished and brought into here, I don't think that that's right. It doesn't do the commission any service, it doesn't do the city any service and it's actually injurious to me. And I really struggled with bringing this up at all because I don't want to humiliate anybody but the facts, somebody went and found the 1911 article to put in here and claimed that it's talking about something that it's not.

Chair Larsen: Duly noted.

Mark Freund: Thank you. Now, according to my notes, I hit the text with the pair of biographies but we've already done that so I won't go back there. The integrity of the property. Since all of my papers hit the floor, please bear with me. Addressing building integrity, I speak to the seven items that are covered in the Secretary of the Interior's website and in true I claim that only location is still intact. The design, staff's findings of the design, I have to dispute somewhat because staff says that the design is intact. I have a statement, my statement is that both the interior and exterior have sustained significant changes from the original design.

Chair Larsen: I think I can save you a little bit of trouble. Certainly our consideration is going to be the exterior.

Mark Freund: Exactly, so here's the current front elevation of the house. They site the 8 windows, the casement windows that are in place. There are 53 windows in the house and those are the only 8 casement windows. And if you remember back to the Purcell house or the Backus house, all of these designs were all casement windows and so they've all been changed significantly.

Chair Larsen: You're suggesting that the upper windows would have once been casement?

Mark Freund: Exactly. As they were per direct reference, as they were in the Hoyt house, as they were in the Backus house, and this over here is decorative blast. There are no double-hung sashes.

Chair Larsen: Would you say that the openings there are in the same location?

Mark Freund: The openings there are in this case, when we get into the east and west elevations we've got, this might be hard to see, the openings originally were up here and we've lost banks of windows which were larger than the sashes. And this is another one that runs, there's a single window covering that former bank of 3 or 4 windows and then two windows in this bank of probably six windows.

Chair Larsen: Is that on that same façade?

Mark Freund: No, this is the east, this is the west. And so based on that, and I didn't get any pictures, but there are some buckling places where the stucco had buckled along with this poor attempt at mimicking what was there that I'm drawing the attention of the exterior issues that the house has.

Chair Larsen: Would you in general agree with some of the other findings that they've made regarding the low pitched roof, also the widely overhanging eaves?

Mark Freund: Absolutely, those are defining factors of a Prairie School type house. We have many examples in Minneapolis, as Purcell and Elmslie were very important architects. And there were a lot of secondary architects that did a lot of building and I do have some pictures of others in Marcy Holmes, specifically, because that's where we are. We've got six examples here of Prairie, actually this is the same house just two different elevations, we've got in slide one and two we've got stucco brick on the lower third emphasizing the horizontal which is what Prairie School is about. (?) ... you've also got the hipped roofs and the front porch line extends $\frac{3}{4}$ across the entire building. On 3 and 4 here you've got the hipped roof, the window box (?) and then probably the best example, this is on 7th Street SE between 5th and 6th – this is an excellent (?) and I actually spoke with the owner because he was there when I took this picture (?) in the process of this I've become a Prairie School aficionado myself. And then we've got this one here where we've got the hipped roof again, so these are just a few. I took a quick drive over a period of about a half hour in Marcy Holmes. I didn't print up all these others, you know 41st and Lyndale there's a really nice example as well. As far as the design, as well, speaking my statements is save several 7x10 and 8x10 rooms, which was the compromise that Marion Alice Parker made when she made this Prairie School. Prairie School are open, flowing, all of these things, which actually Aaron does bring about in one of the possible options instead of demolishing. If we were to get rid of all the front rooms that were added somewhere along the way, we would still be left with a total of 11 rooms, eight of which are 7 or 8 x 10, and I thought I would note that jail cells in Hennepin County are 8x12. I called the county to ask them how big jail cells are.

Chair Larsen: They probably eat better too.

Mark Freund: Could be. Otherwise, other than these 11, that I've identified as original rooms, there's nothing else original in there. Getting down to setting as far as the Secretary Standards, when referring to the Greek Letter Chapter House District and you saw the map, Frat Row is a half mile down the road and then you have a number of peppered and in a sense I liken it to spot zoning, which the City of Minneapolis has been so adamantly opposed to, why this property is, was in 2003 was put in the district is beyond me. Once again, aside from the fact that it was built as a sorority, it's only had sixteen years of Greek participation. In doing that I did drive around the Dinkytown area and noted down all of these properties and there are 20 fraternities and sororities that are not on this Greek

Historic and I went back to find their history anywhere from a couple of properties built in the '50s and '60s all the way to 1900 that have been continuously Greek and they're not in this district. So for whatever reason, it is in the district and I have to deal with that. But I did want to bring that up that the setting, it's not surrounded by other Greek houses, it's surrounded by other houses and so the integrity of setting is, as far as the Greek is concerned, I don't think is a valid point. Materials and workmanship, I've covered some of that in what we talked about earlier. More than 90% of the interior spaces are unlike original in workmanship. This place has been stepped on so many times, we have those original small rooms and we lost, and we covered some of that, and then the other piece, on feeling, I state that there's no feeling of integrity or in significant integrity feeling on this property. When I took this property over, it was blight. The first three months that I owned the property the first thing that I did was I kicked everybody out of the property because they were selling crack and other drugs. There were other things going on. When we went to clean the place up, before we started doing our renovation in there to clean it up and make it livable, I found "Anything Will Help" signs, we had people that were 20 steps away from the freeway, this is what was in there and that is not what my business is. I pride myself on the contributions I've made. I'll share a couple, this is actually one of those, this is room 202 in the house and this is what was left for me, this is what it looks like today. I wanted to point this out as well because in staff's findings in two places they insinuate that in their opinion all I need to do is spruce it up and fix it up a little bit and I don't know how much better you can make a 7x10 room but that's about as good as I can do. This is the room next door, 203, again garbage and whatnot, but this is the clientele that lived there, and this is what 203 looks like today.

Chair Larsen: I think we're satisfied with your ability to improve the property.

Mark Freund: And then just, I will since I've already kind of debunked the kitchen thing, I'll show you pictures of the kitchen today. There's nothing historic about this kitchen.

Chair Larsen: Yeah, I think if we can stay focused on the exterior, because that is really what's going to be our primary ...

Mark Freund: On the exterior, alright well again, let me see where ... sorry, when my papers went flying I lost track. I can speak to this without finding the text because there, I need to get something first. When I mentioned that I took over, I started saying the first three months I owned the property I was approached because I put my For Rent sign in the front yard, I got phone calls from the Minneapolis police, the FBI, and Hennepin County Sheriff, and on none of those occasions over three months did a name repeat, they were looking for people associated with this house from the years. When I got into that house I bought three properties on the same day in May, two rooming houses by (?) and this one. As I had crews in all of them fixing them up and getting them ready, I realized that I had probably not done a wise purchase in tending to when I saw the rooms and what I had. The first thing I did then was, not willing to try to demolish the property, I went and meticulously measured the basement and please don't laugh, my architect is here, and I drew up a three bedroom apartment proposal and I took it down to building and asked them to look at that and tell me the feasibility. They looked at the licensing, they looked at the zoning, and they said that with a rooming house license that this would not be allowed and so I couldn't do this. They didn't tell me that the first time because I have a (?). Tearing down properties is not what I do, and that's why I showed you some before and after pictures of what I do do. So I explored alternatives immediately. One of the things that I did is I landed the fraternity. As I was doing some showings of rooms one gentleman was coming through and we were talking and he asked me what ultimately I would like to do with the house. And I said if I could get a fraternity/sorority that would be great. And his eyes lit up and I landed Kappa Alpha Psi and they were visiting the house as we were doing our renovations. They asked for three alterations, actually one alteration in three places that we did for them that I would not have done in a normal rooming house. I combined rooms, which actually is one of the recommendations that Aaron claims I ignored. I actually did that in 2005 and I'll find the pictures later but they have fire doors between the doors so that you can open them up and whatnot. This is the economic realities of the three options and their recommendations, D2-A, is the total potential as it stands based on the room sizes, I have 9 rooms that can come in at no more than \$300/month and the numbers speak for themselves. Under option 2 where I combine those rooms, the rooms are combined and I could rent those out, but two rooms, two \$300 rooms combined into one do not a \$600 room make. These rooms are \$430 rooms, and so you continue to loose value, and that's what comes down to here. Fourteen rooms, using option 2 that was suggested. And then the third one, and for as much as I'm a Prairie School aficionado I do have a livelihood to make and if I were to remove all of these six rooms, these

two are the only original and these ones up here, although 204 encompasses part of the original bathroom, the bathroom upstairs is off, if I were to do that I would net 11 rooms. This doesn't pay my mortgage and that's not to count utilities. So this has been explored. Aaron and I have had conversations. If he looked for more documentation other than e-mail and our conversations, I wasn't aware of it. But I wanted to address that as these have been explored in depth by me because tearing down is not my first, second, or third option.

Chair Larsen: Can I ask you a question? If you had converted the lower basement level to, I think you were looking at three bedroom, what kind of rent could you get if you were converting them to a 3-bedroom apartment?

Mark Freund: A three bedroom apartment on that site could get \$1,500 a month to \$1,800 a month.

Chair Larsen: And could you feasibility have three 3-bedroom units if you converted each floor to a separate unit?

Mark Freund: I'm going to have Mike Crowe, my builder, speak to that because we went over that as well. The other (?) that's right, it's the bedrooms in the basement. This is not a garden level, it's a full basement.

Chair Larsen: Window wells, you couldn't do window wells?

Mark Freund: That's what they said I couldn't do that with a rooming house license. Oh and that was another part, when I brought the proposal originally to building to ask about the 17 room, or the 3- bedroom apartment, I proposed at that point my rooms because I knew that the neighborhood wouldn't want additional rooms and I was going to stay at 17 rooms and that was not an option.

Chair Larsen: One of the things that just doesn't, you know FYI, one of the things that we have as an option is an historic variance which can alter the ability and sometimes allow for potential alternative uses.

Mark Freund: And one of the other parts that we did explore, because we did explore doing an addition on the back which was something that Aaron had suggested. I took some pictures of some of the other additions to Greek houses, this is actually Fraternity Row, and the one thing that is also contrary to what was just presented is all of these are three story, there are no two story. And when you have an addition of that size, zoning wouldn't allow that today. I would lose all my parking and the lot coverage would be way too much. These were done many years ago, and so putting an addition on the back doesn't help the matter either.

Chair Larsen: I mean, we would consider that a 2 and a half story.

Mark Freund: Pardon me, you would consider that a 2 and a half story?

Chair Larsen: Correct.

Mark Freund: Even back there?

Chair Larsen: Well, from the front.

Mark Freund: Thank you. I'm learning. I did take some pictures the other day because as I was reading the staff findings Aaron talks about the new house and how it's just going to dwarf everything around it. I realize now as you just stated this is a two and a half story, I was going to claim it as a three story, but I think I might defend myself a little bit on this where you might say it's a two and a half story I'm going to say it's a three and a half because up on the fourth floor there are windows, so would this be an unusual 3-story?

Chair Larsen: No, it's probably just a window in the attic space.

Mark Freund: Ok. This is a tall building and that wasn't on ... I was fortunate to get these pictures while there are no leaves because all the other ones ...

Chair Larsen: Does that, that's the neighboring property?

Mark Freund: Yes, this is 1013 and this is 1019, so you see the two of them. So this would be the neighboring on this side. This is also a tall building, and these are the two on the other side. And then one of the other pieces of all of this, and I'm speaking ahead of myself a little bit, but I, that was brought up with the, one of the things was that this Florence Court in particular was brought up as right across the street and how my proposed building would not do that justice. This is what is going to be across the street from this property.

Chair Larsen: We know it very well.

Mark Freund: Yes, and I would like to state that although Marcy Holmes neighborhood had their latest letter was that if HPC agrees to demo, I got unanimous support two times, which is pretty notable, because they don't usually give unanimous anything, and I'm not dissing my neighborhood because I've been there 12 years, but they've been impressed with what I've done. I came original with just a sketch and asked them what they wanted and we grew from there, working together with them and the Marion Ellis Parker House is what that was, so I, this being across the street, I wanted to bring up one of the thoughts that I believe her name was Arvon, had mentioned that my 4-story across from the 6-story would actually create a very nice gateway to the University. And then I think I would like to try to put my things together and have Clarence Knox speak from the perspective of a fraternity because there's also a claim that doing some of these changes would attract a fraternity easily and we'd like to address that.

Chair Larsen: Alright, please step forward.

Clarence Knox: Good evening Commissioners, as Mark said my name is Clarence Knox. I am an alumni advisor for Kappa Alpha Psi, the previous occupants of tonight's item. When we first approached Mark we were looking for a fraternity house. We had just brought back the fraternity to the University. We reactivated it after several years of it being off the University campus. One of the most significant things about this house was it made our fraternity the first predominately African American fraternity to have a house on the University of Minnesota campus, so it was very special. Mark did a lot, he put in a lot to make it livable for us. We did a lot to make it livable, so it was very dear to us. I mean it had a lot of significance for a fraternity that started at the University in 1924, being the first African American fraternity or sorority house there on the campus. We got a lot of acclaim for house, the way it was presented, what we did to it, and it just meant a lot. As the years went on, the feasibility as far as the students living in the house, it brought great deals of attention to the sizes of the rooms, not being able to, the living quarters, for the students. And each year, less and less of the members would be able to stay in the house. And with that, because the fraternity as a whole (?) was in charge of paying the rent, it wasn't feasible for us to continue living in the house. We tried every which way, we worked it every way. Mark was very gracious in allowing us to try to stay there as long as we did, but unfortunately we were not able to. He did put a lot of passion into rehabbing the house for us, trying to make this work. And we would have loved to have stayed, but unfortunately because of the rooming options and the sizing options, we were not able. So, thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak, please step forward.

Len Lampert: My name is Len Lampert. (tape gap) ... 11, it was designed as a fraternity. It has a very strong street presence and I would like to contend that probably the reason that this particular residence has not maintained it's Greek affiliation is that it doesn't have a good street presence, it doesn't function well as a sorority, and so I would also contend that the design is a knock-off of a Purcell and Elmslie style which they developed and a draftsman who left their firm brought that design idea with her. Our development process during this project has been kind of skewed here and we really didn't get in touch with the board and work with you as we should have. And we need to kind of back up and readjust so what we're looking for is some direction or guidance or commentary from you as far as what our latitude is to deal with this property. And that's about all I have to say, we look forward to moving ahead on it though. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Is there anybody else that wishes to speak?

Michael Crowe: I'll keep this brief because I know everybody is starting to get pretty tired. This has been a really long process. We're, I think, into the 14th month on this. We went through sit down meetings with city planning department, historic preservation, several times. Went through submittal processes, went through approval processes, went through moratoriums at the city, put in the area. We had the moratorium lifted with full neighborhood support on what we were doing for this. It was brought up at that point in time that the building had historic significance and we needed to address it in a different way. So it's been a long journey. Quick history of my business, we've been around a long time, almost our entire focus is redoing historic buildings or just plain old buildings. Right now we have a building going in Minneapolis at 1599 8th Street where we took an 85 year old 2-story brick warehouse. Guttled out the whole thing, took the timbers out, shipped the timbers out and we're making reclaimed wood flooring out of that. We added three floors onto that building, put an entire new structure into it and are totally changing the use on it. So we're very comfortable with doing adaptive reuse or changing a building to make it fit in today. This is one of the, and I'm very sad about this ... we never normally recommend tearing down a building. Normally there's a usage you can find for almost any building that will make it functional. The three uses that you can have for this building are, one, as a single family home because of the cost in the neighborhood and the amount of work that it would take to bring it into that. That's basically cost prohibitive. The other two would be some kind of mix of student housing. Whether it's a fraternity, which doesn't seem to fit any fraternity mode that's been going on at the U now or has been for a number of years, or the last one would be some kind of student housing. To make it adaptable for student housing, you'd have to do a number of code compliant things. It would have to be ADA accessible which means putting in an elevator. And a number of life safety, fire sprinklers, wherever, like that. The cost becomes so prohibitive to do that, you'd end up with three units inside, maybe 3 plus a small one bedroom, even using the basement. You can't even cover 50% of your cost to be able to do it on a building like this. So it's cost prohibitive to be able to do it. We considered a building, what I'd consider to be functionally obsolete, which is a shame, I love old buildings, I live in an old building, my office is an old building. Like I said, almost all the projects we do are old buildings. But this is one that is functionally obsolete. It was mentioned that there were no adjacent buildings that were taller. Mark kind of covered that, the one across the street is. There's a six story right across the street. The tenant mix has been, since Mark bought it, most of the people that seem to come in there are not the kind of people that you folks would want to having living next to you and I don't think most of the folks would down there. One of the things that Aaron had said is that the parking wasn't submitted correctly. We have full sketches of all the parking plans and we had proposed in the new site to do all the parking, the bulk of the parking underneath. There is an easement in the back of the property, which is why I drew up this site survey. The easement makes it, you can't expand a building to get elevators in at second exit stairways without taking parking out. Every time you do that you loose parking. Every time you loose parking you loose units. So it's a tough site. You can't go on to the front, you can't go onto the sides. Thanks so much for your help, we really appreciate any help you can give us.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Anybody else who wishes to speak?

Claire Crowe: I'll be brief, I work with Crowe Construction Management and I just wanted to remind the Commission that this building is not actually a historically designated property. It is merely being considered as potentially eligible. Those are the words from the report we got, so I just want you guys to keep that in mind when you're looking at the review of this and that what we're looking to do in the future is celebrate this history in a new viable building for students in the area.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Closing remarks?

Mark Freund: I've got, I wanted to speak briefly to the risks of not redeveloping this property, which I do cover and I guess like they say, show me the money. When I lost the fraternity and had to start renting this again and I put ads out for \$300 rooms I get 58 year old guys with ankle bracelets riding 10-speeds. I have not lowered my standards, I keep high standards. I do credit and criminal background checks on absolutely everybody and we have policies as to how we will take care of that. I do have a lot of young people in the buildings and it's kind of a pact that I have with all of these parents whose kids are under my care. Out of all those individuals I blacked out stuff because I don't have his permission, but only one ever came back with an application in all these years.

Chair Larsen: Let's keep it germane, I think, to talking about the building.

Mark Freund: Well I think it's germane because if I can't do anything with the building, I can't do anything with the building. There are, something that I was going to cover at one point, after I took control of 1013 I was approached by one of the more notorious slum lords, they're still around down in the Dinkytown area, and I could have probably retired with the payday that he offered me. But I take pride in all my history and what I wanted to do on this site and I walked away from that. I couldn't keep this building if I had to just keep it, and that's why I speak to the risks. This is what is going to be back in the neighborhood. What I kicked out in 2005. And that's what's going to come back because there is no one else who's going to take these rooms.

Chair Larsen: Actually I think you did a good job in clarifying that in your report as well.

Mark Freund: Thank you. I think that's it. Well, one other point of clarification. Aaron in the report talks about this being one of first sororities built. It's actually the 6th of 6 in the initial period and the 6th of 9. So it's not the 1st or the 2nd, it's further down the road.

Chair Larsen: Alright, thank you very much. Is there anybody else that wishes to speak either for or against this application please step forward. Ok, seeing none we'll close the public hearing. Commissioners, what's your pleasure? Commissioner Harrison.

Commissioner Harrison: I think I have a clarification for one of the complaints about the staff report. That is that I don't see a conflict between appendix C9 and the sentence that talks about Ethel Bartholomew, and one particular place where it talks about contributions to the kitchen. It doesn't say the kitchen in this house, so I don't think there is a conflict between the 1911 date and the construction date.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Crippen.

Commissioner Crippen: It seems to me that everybody loves this house, we just, nobody knows what to do with it yet and I'm wondering if staff can comment in any more detail regarding some of the things we've heard tonight in terms of knocking down code barriers or what have you. Some of the public testimony talked about high costs resulting from an elevator, that seems a little crazy to me that we'd have to have an elevator in a house like this, but I'm wondering if there are things we can do, perhaps, relating to what the chair said about historic variance, that we can knock down these barriers to make this a usable structure again.

Staff Hanauer: Chair Larsen, Commissioner Crippen, the historic variance is there as a release valve from the zoning code in particular. That's one way it's been used. And for the building code there may be ways to take that into consideration, the historic significance of this property, for a historic variance. No, I don't think that is, the historic variance is for the zoning code, but when a property is designated there has been consideration from the building code for some aspects. I hope that answered it.

Chair Larsen: So, maybe I missed it. There would be an opportunity, while they certainly have to meet building code standards, the zoning, the fact that it's a rooming house and there might be an opportunity to allow conversion to a different type of use that would otherwise be nonconforming in this current zoning map.

Staff Hanauer: Chair Larsen, to the zoning code. Correct.

Staff Byers: Mr. Chair, I should say that we do not have an application on file for an historic variance and we also are not able to vary license requirements. We can only vary or consider varying zoning provisions, not licensing, not any kind of code compliance issues through the historic variance. Through the ordinance we can look at code compliance issues with our colleagues for designated properties.

Chair Larsen: ok, and just for quick clarification, this is a designated property, correct?

Staff Hanauer: Correct.

Commissioner Crippen: So if I could just follow up, what, if licensing is the question and we don't have control over that, how difficult is it for citizens for change a license from rooming house to multi-unit dwelling or whatever. I don't know the first thing, obviously, but.

Staff Byers: Mr. Chair and Commissioner Crippen, I'm not an expert in licensing so I can't speak to it and the concerns that are germane for the certificate of appropriateness are relative to the historic district. Not the use or licensing of the structure. That is a separate issue that the applicant will need to deal with.

Chair Larsen: Correct. Commissioner Anderson.

Commissioner Anderson: This has brought us back to the question, is this historic property. That's what we're looking at tonight.

Chair Larsen: What's your answer?

Commissioner Anderson: And my answer is yes, and I suppose I could make a motion, which I will. I move that we adopt staff findings and deny the demolition application for the property at 1019 University Avenue SE.

Chair Larsen: Ok.

Commissioner Lemmon: I'll second that.

Chair Larsen: Ok, we have a first and a second. Alright, any further discussion?

Commissioner Crippen: I'll just say in defense of my questioning, the reason I brought that up is I think it speaks to economic value. But I'm satisfied with what we've heard.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Mack.

Commissioner Mack: Well we have an unusual situation because it has been found to be part of the Greek Letter Chapter House Historic District and it's been found to be part of that in recent history, so it has that sort of, it has some status, obviously, as a historic structure. I think some of the points that Mr. Freund brought up certainly weigh in to that and maybe reduce its significance. It's short history as a Greek Letter House and I would agree with him that the integrity is not as intact as the staff findings would argue. So I'm of mixed mind. I think that it hasn't found, the resolution of this property isn't all that clear and fortunately we don't have to do that but we do have to tonight figure out if it still holds its historic integrity as in the report and I'm not sure. I could definitely waver on that.

Commissioner Lemmon: Can I make one comment on that? The one thing that we base the historic significance on this property is because of the period of significance. And that period of significance is 1907-1936 for the fraternity district. I said that wrong, the Greek Letter House District. The construction date of this property is 1916 and during the period of significance it was a fraternity, I apologize, it was part of the Greek system. So I guess from that standpoint and the basis for why the city has determined it is significant, it is significant. Whether it's been that for the last 70 years is not really part of why it was originally considered significant. Just so everyone understands that.

Chair Larsen: I think it's a point well taken. I think that's sort of what troubles me. I mean I think to Commissioner Mack's point, that it was not too long ago, just before my tenure, that this was added as a contributing structure, within the Greek Letter House District, and so I think that for us, given the fact that the property is in a similar condition to kind of go against that, those findings at that time, and specifically related to the idea that it was a sorority house back when it was built, has the additional notes of the architects and female architects I think sort of helps and adds on and contributes to that. I struggle, because I certainly feel for the applicant in terms of the usefulness of the structure and I hope that there are creative ways to make it work in the future whether it be through historic variances and other options that may be available, and I'm sure staff would be willing to work with you on that, but I think that I've got to agree with Commissioner Anderson and Commissioner Lemmon. Commissioner Lackovic.

Commissioner Lackovic: I think I'd be a little more squirmish about this, I think we're all kind of looking at this from a number of different angles and I think I'd be even more squirmish if the lot next door hadn't just opened up. I think there's options in combining this site with now the vacant and soon to be possibly vacant lot next door, so there may be some opportunities here to still make this property useful.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Kelly?

Commissioner Kelley: Yes, the only thing that weighs on me, or one of the things that weighs on me is the precedent set with Florence Court. I do come back to the point about Florence Court. The Florence Court building is kind of a mechanism to save a more important apartment block behind it. But, you know this to me, taking the testimony, the wishes of the neighborhood and stuff, the importance of the property that I have heard in the testimony, it doesn't seem to be the most important example of this architect. On the other hand it has been designated recently, in the condition that it's in now. So, like Commissioner Mack, I'm of two minds but I'm kind of leaning more towards granting the application.

Chair Larsen: Ok, Commissioner Mack, you have another comment?

Commissioner Mack: I guess I would more specifically say I don't find it does retain its design integrity or it barely retains its design integrity. It's just kind of hanging on to by threads on the exterior. It sounds like three, at least three facades have changed. I don't know about the back, and that's the only one that ...

Chair Larsen: But I think if we went to that then even the Gurley Candy Factory, is that historic then? I mean there's been changes to many structures over time and I think that's one of the benefits of rehabilitation is to bring the property back to, and we certainly know where those changes have been made, and so in that sense there is an opportunity to put new casement windows in, there's an opportunity to reopen those existing windows, so in that sense although the changes have been made, I think it would be one thing if there would have been additions placed on and all facades and there was no sense of the original design, so ... any other comment? Alright then, we'll call the roll.

Clerk: Commissioner Lackovic?

Commissioner Lackovic: Aye.

Clerk: Anderson?

Commissioner Anderson: Aye.

Clerk: Crippen?

Commissioner Crippen: Aye.

Clerk: Larsen?

Chair Larsen: Aye.

Clerk: Lemmon?

Commissioner Lemmon: Aye.

Clerk: Harrison?

Commissioner Harrison: Aye.

Clerk: Mack?

Commissioner Mack: Nay.

Clerk: Kelley?

Commissioner Kelley: Nay.

Chair Larsen: Ok that motion carries.

(BZH 25782)

ITEM SUMMARY

Address: 1013-1019 University Avenue SE – Greek Letter Chapter House Historic District, Ward 3

Description: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed new construction of a 23-unit apartment building.

Action: **Adopt** staff findings and **deny** the Certificate of Appropriateness application for new construction at 1013-1019 University Avenue S.E

TRANSCRIPTION

Chair Larsen: Alright, that brings us to our public hearing for the construction of the new proposed addition, and seeing as the previous application was denied for the demolition, we'll certainly open the public hearing for that item and let anybody speak if they wish, but we certainly had our staff report at that time. So, we'll open up the public hearing for item #5, 1013-1019 University Avenue SE. We'll open the public hearing, is there anybody that wishes to speak for or against the application?

Mark Freund: I guess I have just one, just a couple of comments. It's almost pointless, but the proposal for the replacement of 1013 and 1019 as you see it is in a sense a monument to Marion Alice Parker, as that building would carry her name. There would be display inside, something that would really celebrate her on that block for another 100 years. The property as it stands won't stand for another hundred years. That was the whole reason for that proposal and taking that direction. If you saw some of the things in there, it was originally the Freund House. I changed that when I started studying Marion Alice Parker and decided that she had a place permanently on that block. Those are the only comments I've got about that.

Chair Larsen: Thank you very much. Is there anybody else? Ok, we'll close the public hearing. Do we need to take, I suppose we need to take an action, ok. So, the recommended action is, Commissioner Lemmon?

Commissioner Lemmon: I'll make a motion that we adopt staff findings and deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction at 1013-1019 University Avenue SE.

Chair Larsen: Ok, is there a second to that motion?

Commissioner Crippen: I'll second that.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Crippen, thank you. Any discussion on the item, on the motion? Seeing none, we'll call the roll.

Clerk: Commissioner Lackovic?

Commissioner Lackovic: Aye.

Clerk: Anderson?

Commissioner Anderson: Aye.

Clerk: Crippen?

Commissioner Crippen: Aye.

Clerk: Larsen?

Chair Larsen: Aye.

Clerk: Lemmon?

Commissioner Lemmon: Aye.

Clerk: Harrison?

Commissioner Harrison: Aye.

Clerk: Mack?

Commissioner Mack: Aye.

Clerk: Kelley?

Commissioner Kelley: Aye.

Chair Larsen: Ok, that motion carries.