

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS  
HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**

FILE NAME: 900 3<sup>rd</sup> Street North (BZH 25783)

CATEGORY/DISTRICT: Minneapolis Warehouse National Historic District (Interim Protection)

CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness

APPLICANT: Walsh Bishop Associates: Troy Goetz (612) 414-5055 on behalf of FTK Properties

DATE OF APPLICATION: February 16, 2009

PUBLICATION DATE: May 5, 2009

DATE OF HEARING: May 12, 2009

APPEAL PERIOD EXPIRATION : May 22, 2009

STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Aaron Hanauer (612) 673-2494

REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness for Rehabilitation Project

***A. SITE DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND:***

<b>District/Area Information</b>	
Historic District	National Register Warehouse District: Interim Protection (see Appendix A2)
District Areas of Significance	Criteria A. associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;  Criteria C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master; or possess high artistic values, or represent a significant concentration of resources whose individual components are united historically by function or plan;
Neighborhood	North Loop
Date of Local Designation	N/A
Period of Significance	Circa 1865-1930
<b>Historic Property Information</b>	
Address	900 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street North
Classification	Contributing to the National Register Warehouse District
Construction Date	1919
Original Contractor	Charles L. Pillsbury Company
Original Architect	Tyrie & Chapman
Historical Use	Manufacturing
Current Use	Warehouse
Proposed Use	Office/Restaurant
Historic Name	Gurley Candy Factory

The Gurley Candy Company Building is a four-story, six bay, rectangular structure designed in a plain Commercial Style. The façade is articulated through a series of enframed brick pilasters. A semicircular arch above the entry (southwest elevation) is also present.

## **B. APPLICATION BACKGROUND**

At the April 14 HPC meeting, the applicant received approval for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the rehabilitation and new construction project with conditions (see Appendix B3 and B4). The proposed work to the louvers, southwest elevation addition, rooftop vat, chimney, new penthouse, and site plan were approved without conditions. The proposed work to the masonry and existing penthouse was approved with conditions, including the condition that final rehabilitation proposal receive Heritage Preservation Commission approval (see Appendix B3 and B4). The work to the windows, entrances, northeast elevation loading dock, northeast elevation canopy, and southeast elevation loading dock were not approved as part of the Certificate of Appropriateness (see Appendix B3 and B4).

The applicant has revised their plans/provided additional information for the proposed work to the masonry and rooftop penthouse to address the Heritage Preservation Commission conditions of approval. The applicant has also revised their plans/provided additional information for their proposed work to the windows, entrances, northeast elevation loading dock, northeast elevation canopy, and southeast elevation loading dock which did not receive HPC approval. Section D provides a review of the seven items that were either approved with conditions or not approved at the April 14 HPC meeting.

## **C. REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

Required findings for certificate of appropriateness. In general. Before approving a certificate of appropriateness, the commission shall make findings that the alteration will not materially impair the integrity of the landmark, historic district or nominated property under interim protection and is consistent with the applicable design guidelines adopted by the commission, or if design guidelines have not been adopted, is consistent with the recommendations contained in The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, except as otherwise provided in this section.

## **D. PROPOSED WORK AND ANALYSIS**

As part of the revised plans, staff analyzed the seven items that were either approved with conditions or not approved at the April 14 HPC meeting.

### ***1. Masonry***

**Background:** At the April 14 HPC meeting, staff recommended four conditions of approval to the proposed work to the masonry. The commission slightly modified the conditions of approval by adding that acid shall not be used for rehabilitation and that testing should be done to ensure that new mortar matches original mortar.

**Proposed Work:** The applicant has proposed to meet all conditions of approval for masonry. In addition, the applicant has provided details of the test procedures that are proposed for the masonry and brick (see Appendix A10.5).

**Analysis:** The applicant's proposed masonry work will meet the commission conditions of approval and the Secretary of Interior masonry guidelines.

## 2. Windows

**Background:** At the April 14 HPC meeting, the commission denied the proposed replacement windows, and removed conditions of approval #6, and #8-22 (see Appendix B2.1 and B2.2). In reviewing the meeting recording it appears a majority of commissioners approved the proposed replacement of all steel windows and the proposed fenestration pattern; however, the proposed 30-inch wide windows and anodized aluminum finish were not acceptable.

**Proposed Work:** The applicant has modified their window proposal in at least five ways:

1. The original proposal had typical windows that were 30 inches in width. The revised proposal has windows that are 60-inch in width (see Appendix A5 and A11-A14).
2. The window operation proposed in the original submittal stated the windows would have a 25 percent operable casement window, however additional details were not provided. The revised proposal shows that the middle bay windows on the northeast elevation are proposed to have an outswing transom window and that windows on the other elevations will also have an outswing transom windows.
3. The original window finish was proposed to be anodized. The applicant has stated in the revised application that they will proceed with a painted finish (see Appendix A3).
4. The original submittal had glazing that spanned Bays 5 and 6 on the first floor of the southeast elevation. The revised proposal has widow openings that are separated by a brick pilaster (see Appendix B5).
5. The original submittal showed a row of windows in Bays 3 and 4 on the southeast elevation with replacement windows that partially filled in the original opening. The revised proposal has these rows of windows span the original window opening (see Appendix B5).

**Analysis:** The revised proposal for window finish and fenestration is more compatible with the building, the district, and the Secretary of Interior Guidelines for Windows. CPED recommends the following conditions of approval for the proposed replacement windows.

1. The window frames will have a painted finish or pre-finish to replicate paint.
2. The proposed windows shall be recessed at the same location of the original windows.

## 3. Entrances

**Background:** At the April 14 HPC meeting, the commission removed staff's proposed conditions of approval #29-31 which recommended that the applicant retain existing and/original entrance openings (see Appendix B2.1 and B2.2). However, the commission retained the condition of approval that anodized aluminum will not be allowed.

**Proposed Work:** The applicant states in the resubmitted materials that they will proceed with the HPC condition of approval that entrance doors will have a painted finish (see Appendix A3).

**Analysis:** CPED recommends the HPC condition of approval be retained that requires the entrance door to have a painted finish or pre-finish to replicate paint for the door.

## 4. Northeast Elevation Loading Dock/Accessible Entrance

**Background:** The northeast elevation contains a loading dock that is original to the building.

**Proposed Work:** The applicant is proposing to construct an accessible entrance on the northeast elevation that incorporates a portion of the original loading dock and constructs a railing along the accessible entrance (see Appendix A7 and A17). The applicant's proposal for the accessible entrance still proposes to remove the southeast elevation loading dock.

The proposed material and design for the railing has not changed from the initial proposal, however, the applicant has provided additional information about the material (see Appendix A7). For the accessible entrance railing, the applicant is proposing to use an industrial welded mesh guardrail within a painted steel frame that is built to a height of seven feet three inches at its highest point.

**Analysis:** Staff believes that the overall proposal for the accessible entrance is still not appropriate for the building. The existing proposal for the accessible entrance still includes the loss of the southeast elevation (9<sup>th</sup> Avenue) loading dock which is a character defining feature of the building and district. The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation calls for the retention of character defining features. Staff believes that an accessible entrance can be constructed at the northeast elevation which still retains the southeast elevation loading dock.

The design of the railing material is also not compatible with the building nor the district. The proposed mesh guardrail may appear similar to a chain link fence which would not be appropriate for a warehouse building nor the district.

## **5. Northeast Elevation Canopy**

**Background:** At the April 14 HPC meeting, the Commission denied the proposed canopy that extended approximately 10.5 feet from the northeast elevation.

**Proposed Work:** The applicant is proposing to remove the existing shed roof style canopy and construct a horizontal canopy that is approximately 10 feet in width and projects approximately five feet from the building (see Appendix A7 and A16).

**Analysis:** The removal of the existing shed roof style canopy, which is a character defining feature of the building, is not appropriate for the building, and is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Staff realizes that the existing canopy is unlikely original to the building; however, the existing canopy is similar to other canopies that were and still are on warehouses and manufacturing buildings within the district. These canopies help unify the buildings within the district.

One local example of a new shed roof style canopy being added to replace a shed roof style canopy from an earlier time period is the Mill City Museum (see Appendix B1 and B2).

## **6. Southeast Elevation (9<sup>th</sup> Avenue) Loading Dock**

**Background:** At the April 14 HPC meeting, the removal of the 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue raised platform was not approved. It is noted that when reviewing the meeting discussion, commissioners had concerns that the retention of the southeast elevation loading dock would negatively impact the pedestrian streetscape.

**Proposed Work:** The applicant has modified their proposal along the 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue elevation. The applicant now proposes to remove the loading dock and cast a concrete wall that identifies the original loading dock location (see Appendix A7-A9).

**Analysis:** The removal of the southeast elevation loading dock, which is a character defining feature of the building, is not appropriate for the building, and is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Similar loading docks are seen throughout the warehouse district and these loading docks help unify the buildings within the district.

Loading docks built in the right-of-way add an element of complexity in creating a pedestrian-friendly streetscape; however, they do not necessarily detract from a pedestrian-friendly streetscape and steps can be taken to retain them while not interrupting the pedestrian path. One example would be to construct a sidewalk to the outside of the loading dock. One example of this configuration is the Mill City Museum loading dock (see Appendix B1 and B2). In addition to not detracting from the pedestrian streetscape, the loading docks can create unique gathering places such as restaurant patios for those buildings being converted from their original use.

## ***7. Rooftop Penthouses Existing***

**Background:** At the April 14, 2009 HPC meeting, the commission added as a condition of approval that the applicant protect and repair the penthouse masonry on the southeast façade

**Proposed Work:** The applicant is proposing to retain the penthouse masonry on the southeast elevation and clad on the other facades with a vertical standing seamed metal panel with a weathered dark zing coating.

**Analysis:** The applicant's proposed work to the rooftop penthouses meets the HPC conditions of approval.

## **E. FINDINGS**

1. The National Register Warehouse Historic District is under interim protection and exterior alterations must meet requirements of Chapter 599.
2. The National Register Warehouse Historic District meets National Register Criteria A and C for significance.
3. The District's period of significance is 1865-1930.
4. The applicant's proposed masonry work meets the masonry guidelines provided by the Secretary of Interior.
5. The revised proposal for window finish and fenestration is more compatible with the building, the district, and the Secretary of Interior Guidelines for Windows, than the original proposal.
6. The overall proposal for the accessible entrance is not appropriate for the building. The existing proposal for the accessible entrance still includes the loss of the southeast elevation (9<sup>th</sup> Avenue) loading dock which is a character defining feature of the building. The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation calls for the retention of character defining features.
7. The design of the railing material is not compatible with the building nor the district.
8. The removal of the existing shed roof style canopy, which is a character defining feature of the building, is not appropriate for the building, and is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards. The existing canopy is unlikely original to the building; however, the canopy is a character defining feature of the building and a unifying characteristic of the buildings in the warehouse district.

9. The removal of the southeast elevation loading dock, which is a character defining feature of the building, is not appropriate for the building, and is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards.
10. Loading docks built in the right-of-way add an element of complexity in creating a pedestrian-friendly streetscape; however, they do not necessarily detract from a pedestrian-friendly streetscape and steps can be taken to retain them while not interrupting the pedestrian path.
11. The applicant's proposed work to the rooftop penthouses meets the HPC conditions of approval.

#### **F. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the HPC adopt staff findings and **approve** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the 900 3<sup>rd</sup> Street rehabilitation project with the following conditions

1. CPED-Planning review and approve final site plan, floor plans, and elevations.
2. The window frames will have a painted black finish or black pre-finish to replicate paint.
3. The proposed windows shall be recessed at the same location of the original windows.
4. The proposed doors shall have a black painted finish or black pre-finish to replicate paint.
5. The applicant make the necessary repair to the brick work around the northeast elevation canopy
6. The applicant retains the existing northeast elevation canopy or replaces it in kind.
7. The applicant retains the southeast elevation loading dock or replaces it in kind.

#### **G. APPENDIX**

Appendix A: Application

Appendix B: CPED Information