

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

FILE NAME: 516 Hennepin Avenue, Shubert Theater and 524 530 Hennepin Avenue, Hennepin Center for the Arts (Masonic Temple)
DATE OF APPLICATION: November 4, 2008
APPLICANT: Will Law, Artspace Projects Inc. 612-465-0224
PUBLICATION DATE: December 10, 2008
DATE OF HEARING: December 16, 2008
END OF APPEAL PERIOD: December 26, 2008
HPC SITE/DISTRICT: Individual Landmarks
CATEGORY: contributing
CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness
STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Molly McCartney
DATE: December 16, 2008

A. SITE DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND:

The landmarks affected by this application include both the Shubert Theater at 516 Hennepin Avenue and the Hennepin Center for the Arts at 524-530 Hennepin Avenue also known by its historic name, the Masonic Temple. This application is for the Minnesota Shubert Performing Arts and Education Center, which includes the rehabilitation of the Shubert Theater, new building construction between the two buildings, and a building addition to rear of the Shubert Theater. Minor work to the Hennepin Center for the Arts will also be undertaken.

Shubert Theater

The Sam S. Shubert Theatre was designed by the New York architect, William Albert Swasey, and constructed in 1910 by the J.L. Robinson Company at its original location, 22 – 7th Street North. Leading Minneapolis interior designer John S. Bradstreet originally decorated the interior. It is significant to the history of the performing arts in Minnesota for the role it played in Minneapolis theater history. The three-story, Classic Revival style Shubert Theatre is architecturally significant as a distinctive example of historic theater design, as Minneapolis' only remaining two-balcony theater, and as the work of nationally known theater architect.

Swasey employed innovative theater design in the design of the Shubert Theater in 1910. The theater's design focused on fireproofing, superior sight lines and acoustics, set-building facilities, and audience comfort. A lack of columns provided every seat a view of at least two-thirds of the entire stage. The theater was constructed on a relatively small parcel of land in a dense urban setting requiring efficient use of interior space, including the introduction of the double balcony.

The theater was locally designated in 1990 and placed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1995. The National Register designation includes the interior of the theater. The Shubert was locally designated in 1990 (Attachments, page A29-A32) and at that time included the interior public spaces as part of the designation. Also included in the Council action designating the Shubert was the condition to allow for demolition of the Shubert if a developer under contract with the City meet particular contractual obligations. It appears as if the obligations were not meet; the Shubert was not demolished after the designation and was moved to its current location at 516 Hennepin Avenue in 1999. This is an

unusual condition for a designation and the City has treated the interior of the theater as not protected in the past. Prior to the move, the rear Stage House was demolished. Since the move to Hennepin Avenue, the building has remained vacant.

Masonic Temple

The Masonic Temple, at the corner of Hennepin Avenue and 6th Street, is representative of the Richardsonian Romanesque style of architecture. The architecture firm of Long and Kees designed offices and lodging space for the Masonic Temple Association of Minneapolis. Careful attention to exterior detail is found in the intricately carved motifs, especially along the Hennepin Avenue façade. The words “Masonic Temple” along with the symbols of the terrestrial and celestial globes were carved into the sandstone. The building remains in good condition; however, the two Moorish onion domes placed on the southwest and southeast corner towers were removed due to deterioration prior to the building’s historic designation.

The Masonic Temple is mostly frequently referred to as the Hennepin Center for the Arts (Hennepin Center for the Arts), which placed on the National Register in 1975 and locally designated in 1980. In 1978, the building was purchased and renovated as the Hennepin Center for the Arts to provide performing, teaching, studio and office facilities for non-profit arts organizations. Retail, bar, and restaurant uses also occupy the building.

Previous HPC approvals

The HPC approved a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to the Shubert Theater and Hennepin Center for the Arts as well as new construction in November 2007 (*Attachments, page A27-A28*). These changes included exterior and interior improvements, new signage on the Shubert, the reconstruction of the Shubert stage house, and new construction between the Shubert and the Hennepin Center for the Arts . The applicant is returning at this time for a new design that alters the previously approved plans. Changes include removal of the Shubert balconies, new material for the stage house, and change in design of the new construction.

B. PROPOSED CHANGES:

The applicant is proposing modifications to the Shubert Theater and new construction. The proposed work includes the reconstruction of the Shubert stage house, exterior and interior alterations to the Shubert Theater, and a building addition between the Shubert and the Hennepin Center for the Arts (Hennepin Center for the Arts). The building addition will become the primary entrance to the Shubert and the Hennepin Center for the Arts.

Restoration of the Shubert Theater stage house

The reconstruction of the proposed Stage House of the Shubert Theater is a result of a redevelopment agreement by the City of Minneapolis. As documented in the attachment on page 76, the Stage House was not viable to be moved with the main portion of the Shubert in 1998. Per the agreement with the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office and the National Park Service, the City agreed that the Stage House would be replicated at the new location. The new Stage House addition replicates the size, height, and design of the original. The Stage House is located approximately 47 ft. to the rear of the façade of the theater and is five stories, two stories taller than the height of the theater. The exterior is clad in beige colored brick and there is a stepped parapet wall facing the front of the building. The Stage House encompasses the actual stage for the Shubert Theater as will also be used for typical theater uses, such as set designs as well as a retractable band shell.

2. Shubert Theater

Shubert Theater Exterior

The façade of the Shubert is proposed to be restored to the original features. The façade of the Shubert has terracotta details, including four sets of Ionic columns that separate three sets of arched windows, a balustrade, and parapet wall. Repair work, as well as cleaning of the terracotta is proposed. New aluminum windows and wood doors that replicate the originals will be installed. The three sets of windows on the second floor will be replaced with aluminum-clad wood windows. The entrance doors are also to be replaced with wood replicas of the original. The doors of the Shubert are proposed to be used as exit only door, with the new addition being the primary entrance for both the Hennepin Center for the Arts and the Shubert.

In addition to replicating the windows and doors, the applicant is proposing to replicate the original awning and marquee for the Shubert. The awning will be a steel clad canopy that will run almost the length of the façade, covering the five entrances. The sloping awning will be located under the first floor belt line and will be attached to the building with steel tie-rod to the second floor.

The proposed Shubert sign will be located in the middle of the existing structure, above the awning and stretching to the cornice line. The will have the letters of the word “Shubert” in encased in circles and positioned vertically on the building. At the bottom of the vertical sign, there will be space for additional copy. While the Shubert sign is being considered a marquee sign, its style does not meet the definition of marquee in the zoning or the preservation code, so the sign will be measured like a projecting sign.

Shubert Theater Interior

The interior of the theater has undergone significant loss of fabric since the period of significance (1910-1933), including changes to the lobby, removal of box seating, and removal of decorative plaster from the walls and ceilings. During the move of the theater in 1999, the stage house was demolished, and the proscenium stands without a stage behind it. The applicant is not proposing to recreate the decorative plasterwork, however, there are two existing plaster columns that flank the proscenium that will be restored. Interior elevations were not provided as part of the application.

The proposed floor plans of the interior show five tiers of seating, a storage room between the auditorium and the lobby area. The second floor shows six tiers of seating and the floors above are open to the seating below. The open space on these floors indicate that the balconies are proposed to be removed.

The previous HPC approval from November 2007 included reusing the two balconies for seating; however, the applicant is now proposing to remove the balconies in this proposal. In the applicant’s written “Description of the Project” (*Attachments, page A3-A4*), the removal of the balconies is documented as required due to conflicts with the structural capacity of the theater and modern building code requirements for loading for the reuse of the building.

3. New construction

The infill addition is located between the Hennepin Center for the Arts and the Shubert Theater and is proposed to be the main entrance for both the Hennepin Center for the Arts and the Shubert. The proposed new construction is a two-story building, clad in metal panels with a cosmetic metal “mesh” screen on the second story of the building. The ground floor consists of a set of double glass doors and

LED screens that will project images. Above the ground floor is proposed to be a dynamic marquee-like LED sign as well.

The first floor houses the main lobby for the Shubert and the Hennepin Center for the Arts, including concessions, restrooms facilities, and other utility spaces. The second story has a studio space along the façade of the building, with an open space to the lobby area in the rear of the addition. The first and second stories are proposed to have connections to both the Hennepin Center for the Arts and Shubert buildings.

The façade of the addition is proposed to be metal panels with a metal “mesh” screen covering with a large window opening to the studio space on the second floor. The metal mesh projects into the right of way at an obtuse angle on the northern portion of the façade. The applicant has stated that the metal mesh is proposed to have backlighting as well. The mesh is also proposed to project past the addition’s façade and over the corners of the adjacent buildings. The mesh is proposed to cover up to two feet of the adjacent Shubert and Hennepin Center for the Arts buildings.

New infill signs

The proposed addition will have a number of signs, including a marquee-type sign above the entrances, monitor on the first floor façade, and signage above the entrance doors. The marquee sign will have internally projected text and images that will change with programming and events. The first floor monitor will preview onsite programming and events as well. The wall sign above the entrance doors identifies the Minnesota Shubert Performing Arts and Education Center.

C. GUIDELINE CITATIONS (pages 4-18):

There are no local guidelines for the Shubert Theater or Hennepin Center for the Arts, so the following Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are used to evaluate the proposed new construction. In addition, the National Park Service's Technical Preservation Brief #16 The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors is used for evaluation (Attachments, page A78-A92).

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, 1990

Masonry: *Brick, stone, terra cotta, concrete, adobe, stucco, and mortar*

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving masonry features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as walls, brackets, railings, cornices, window architraves, door pediments, steps, and columns; and joint and unit size, tooling and bonding patterns, coatings, and color.

Protecting and maintaining masonry by providing proper drainage so that water does not stand on flat, horizontal surfaces or accumulate in curved decorative features.

Cleaning masonry only when necessary to halt deterioration or remove heavy soiling.

Carrying out masonry surface cleaning tests after it has been determined that such cleaning is necessary. Tests should be observed over a sufficient period of time so that both the immediate effects and the long range effects are known to enable selection of the gentlest method possible.

Cleaning masonry surfaces with the gentlest method possible, such as low pressure water and detergents, using natural bristle brushes.

Inspecting painted masonry surfaces to determine whether repainting is necessary.

Removing damaged or deteriorated paint only to the next sound layer using the gentlest method possible (e.g., hand scraping) prior to repainting.

Applying compatible paint coating systems following proper surface preparation.

Repainting with colors that are historically appropriate to the building and district.

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

Repairing masonry walls and other masonry features by repointing the mortar joints where there is evidence of deterioration such as disintegrating mortar, cracks in mortar joints, loose bricks, damp walls, or damaged plasterwork.

Removing deteriorated mortar by carefully hand raking the joints to avoid damaging the masonry.

Duplicating old mortar in strength, composition, color, and texture.

Duplicating old mortar joints in width and in joint profile.

Repairing stucco by removing the damaged material and patching with new stucco that duplicates the old in strength, composition, color, and texture.

Using mud plaster as a surface coating over unfired, unstabilized adobe because the mud plaster will bond to the adobe.

Repairing masonry features by patching, piecing in, or consolidating the masonry using recognized preservation methods. Repair may also include the limited replacement in kind or with compatible substitute material of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of masonry features when there are surviving prototypes such as terra cotta brackets or stone balusters.

Applying new or non historic surface treatments such as water repellent coatings to masonry only after repointing and only if masonry repairs have failed to arrest water penetration problems.

Replacing in kind an entire masonry feature that is too deteriorated to repair if the overall form and detailing are still evident using the physical evidence to guide the new work. Examples can include large sections of a wall, a cornice, balustrade, column, or stairway. 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 installing a new masonry feature such as steps or a door pediment when the historic feature is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

Not Recommended:

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

Replacing or rebuilding a major portion of exterior masonry walls that could be repaired so that, as a result, the building is no longer historic and is essentially new construction.

Applying paint or other coatings such as stucco to masonry that has been historically unpainted or uncoated to create a new appearance.

Removing paint from historically painted masonry.

Radically changing the type of paint or coating or its color.

Failing to evaluate and treat the various causes of mortar joint deterioration such as leaking roofs or gutters, differential settlement of the building, capillary action, or extreme weather exposure.

Cleaning masonry surfaces when they are not heavily soiled to create a new appearance, thus needlessly introducing chemicals or moisture into historic materials.

Cleaning masonry surfaces without testing or without sufficient time for the testing results to be of value.

Sandblasting brick or stone surfaces using dry or wet grit or other abrasives. These methods of cleaning permanently erode the surface of the material and accelerate deterioration.

Using a cleaning method that involves water or liquid chemical solutions when there is any possibility of freezing temperatures.

Cleaning with chemical products that will damage masonry, such as using acid on limestone or marble, or leaving chemicals on masonry surfaces.

Applying high pressure water cleaning methods that will damage historic masonry and the mortar joints.

Removing paint that is firmly adhering to, and thus protecting, masonry surfaces.

Using methods of removing paint which are destructive to masonry, such as sandblasting, application of caustic solutions, or high pressure waterblasting.

Failing to follow manufacturers' product and application instructions when repainting masonry.

Using new paint colors that are inappropriate to the historic building and district.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of masonry features.

Removing non deteriorated mortar from sound joints, then repointing the entire building to achieve a uniform appearance.

Using electric saws and hammers rather than hand tools to remove deteriorated mortar from joints prior to repointing.

Repointing with mortar of high portland cement content (unless it is the content of the historic mortar). This can often create a bond that is stronger than the historic material and can cause damage as a result of the differing coefficient of expansion and the differing porosity of the material and the mortar.

Repointing with a synthetic caulking compound.

Using a "scrub" coating technique to repoint instead of traditional repointing methods.

Changing the width or joint profile when repointing.

Removing sound stucco; or repairing with new stucco that is stronger than the historic material or does not convey the same visual appearance.

Applying cement stucco to unfired, unstabilized adobe. Because the cement stucco will not bond properly, moisture can become entrapped between materials, resulting in accelerated deterioration of the adobe.

Replacing an entire masonry feature such as a cornice or balustrade when repair of the masonry 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 masonry feature or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Applying waterproof, water repellent, or non historic coatings such as stucco to masonry as a substitute for repointing and masonry repairs. Coatings are frequently unnecessary, expensive, and may change the appearance of historic masonry as well as accelerate its deterioration.

Removing a masonry feature that is unreparable 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 masonry feature is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

Introducing a new masonry feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

Windows

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving windows and their functional and decorative features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Such features can include frames, sash, muntins, glazing, sills, heads, hoodmolds, paneled or decorated jambs and moldings, and interior and exterior shutters and blinds.

Protecting and maintaining the wood and architectural metal which comprise the window frame, sash, muntins, and surrounds through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re application of protective coating systems.

Making windows weather tight by recaulking and replacing or installing weather stripping. These actions also improve thermal efficiency.

Evaluating the overall condition of materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, i.e. if repairs to windows and window features will be required.

Repairing window frames and sash by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing. Such repair may also include replacement in kind of those parts that are either extensively deteriorated or are missing when there are surviving prototypes such as architraves, hoodmolds, sash, sills, and interior or exterior shutters and blinds.

Replacing in kind an entire window that is too deteriorated to repair if the overall form and detailing are still evident using the physical evidence to guide the new work. If using the same kind of materials is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Designing and installing new windows when the historic windows (frame, sash and glazing) are completely missing. The replacement windows may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the window openings and the historic character of the building.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Designing and installing additional windows on rear or other non character defining elevations if required by the new use. New windows openings may also be cut into exposed party walls. Such design

should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character defining elevation.

Providing a setback in the design of dropped ceilings when they are required for the new use to allow for the full height of the window openings.

Not Recommended:

Removing or radically changing windows, which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Changing the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows, through cutting new openings, blocking in windows, and installing replacement sash, which does not fit the historic window opening.

Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which radically change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of the glazing; or the appearance of the frame.

Obscuring historic window trim with metal or other material.

Stripping windows of historic material such as wood, iron, cast iron, and bronze.

Failing to provide adequate protection of materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of the windows results.

Retrofitting or replacing windows rather than maintaining the sash, frame, and glazing.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of historic windows.

Replacing an entire window when repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

Failing to reuse serviceable window hardware such as brass lifts and sash locks.

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

Removing a character-defining window that is unrepairable and blocking it in; or replacing it with a new window that does not convey the same visual appearance.

Design for Missing Historic Features

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

Introducing a new design that is incompatible with the historic character of the building.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Installing new windows, including frames, sash, and muntin configuration that are incompatible with the building's historic appearance or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

Inserting new floors or furred down ceilings, which cut across the glazed areas of the windows so that the exterior form and appearance of the windows are changed.

Interior: Spaces, Features, and Finishes

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving a floor plan or interior spaces that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the size, configuration, proportion, and relationship of rooms and corridors; the relationship of features to spaces; and the spaces themselves such as lobbies, reception halls, entrance halls, double parlors, theaters, auditoriums, and important industrial or commercial use spaces.

Identifying, retaining, and preserving interior features and finishes that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building, including columns, cornices, baseboards, fireplaces and mantles, paneling, light fixtures, hardware, and flooring; and wallpaper, plaster, paint, and finishes such as stenciling, marbling, and graining; and other decorative materials that accent interior features and provide color, texture, and patterning to walls, floors, and ceilings.

Protecting and maintaining masonry, wood, and architectural metals which comprise interior features through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coatings systems.

Protecting interior features and finishes against arson and vandalism before project work begins, erecting protective fencing, boarding-up windows, and installing fire alarm systems that are keyed to local protection agencies.

Protecting interior features such as a staircase, mantel, or decorative finishes and wall coverings against damage during project work by covering them with heavy canvas or plastic sheets.

Installing protective coverings in areas of heavy pedestrian traffic to protect historic features such as wall coverings, parquet flooring and paneling.

Removing damaged or deteriorated paints and finishes to the next sound layer using the gentlest method possible, then repainting or refinishing using compatible paint or other coating systems.

Repainting with colors that are appropriate to the historic building.

Limiting abrasive cleaning methods to certain industrial or warehouse buildings where the interior masonry or plaster features do not have distinguishing design, detailing, tooling, or finishes; and where wood features are not finished, molded, breaded, or worked by hand. Abrasive cleaning should only be considered after other, gentler methods have been proven ineffective.

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

Repairing interior features and finishes by reinforcing the historic materials. Repair will also generally include the limited replacement in kind-or with compatible substitute material-of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of repeated features when there are surviving prototypes such as stairs, balustrades, wood paneling, columns; or decorative wall coverings or ornamental tin or plaster ceilings.

Replacing in kind an entire interior feature or finish that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. Examples could include wainscoting, a tin ceiling, or interior stairs. 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 installing a new interior feature or finish if the historic feature or finish is completely missing. This could include missing partitions, stairs, elevators, lighting fixtures, and wall coverings; or even entire rooms if all historic spaces, features, and finishes are missing or have been destroyed by inappropriate “renovations.” The design 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 building, district, or neighborhood.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Accommodating service functions such as bathrooms, mechanical equipment, and office machines required by the building’s new use in secondary spaces such as first floor service areas or on upper floors.

Reusing decorative material or features that have had to be removed during the rehabilitation work including wall and baseboard trim, door molding, paneled doors, and simple wainscoting; and relocating such material or features in areas appropriate to their historic placement.

Installing permanent partitions in secondary spaces; removable partitions that do not destroy the sense of space should be installed when the new use requires the subdivision of character-defining interior spaces.

Enclosing an interior stairway where required by code so that its character is retained. In many cases, glazed fire-rated walls may be used.

Placing new code-required stairways or elevators in secondary and service areas of the historic building.

Creating an atrium or a light well to provide natural light when required for the new use in a manner that preserves character-defining interior spaces, features, and finishes as well as the structural system.

Adding a new floor if required for the new use in a manner that preserves character-defining structural features, and interior spaces, features, and finishes.

Not Recommended:

Radically changing a floor plan or interior spaces - including individual rooms - which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Altering the floor plan by demolishing principal walls and partitions to create a new appearance.

Altering or destroying interior spaces by inserting floors, cutting through floors, lowering ceilings, or adding or removing walls.

Relocating an interior feature such as a staircase so that the historic relationship between features and spaces is altered.

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

Installing new decorative material that obscures or damages character-defining interior features or finishes.

Removing paint, plaster, or other finishes from historically finished surfaces to create a new appearance (e.g., removing plaster to expose masonry surfaces such as brick walls or a chimney piece).

Applying paint, plaster, or other finishes to surfaces that have been historically unfinished to create a new appearance.

Stripping historically painted wood surfaces to bare wood, then applying clear finishes or stains to create a “natural look.”

Stripping paint to bare wood rather than repairing or reapplying grained or marbled finishes or stains to create a “natural look.”

Radically changing the type of finish or its color, such as painting a previously varnished wood feature.

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

Permitting entry into historic buildings through unsecured or broken windows and doors so that interior features and finishes are damaged by exposure to weather or through vandalism.

Stripping interiors of features such as woodwork, doors, windows, light fixtures, copper piping, radiators; or of decorative materials.

Failing to provide proper protection of interior features and finishes during work so that they are gouged, scratched, dented, or otherwise damaged.

Failing to take new use patterns into consideration so that interior features and finishes are damaged.

Using destructive methods such as propane or butane torches or sandblasting to remove paint or other coatings. These methods can irreversibly damage the historic materials that comprise interior features.

Using new paint colors that are inappropriate to the historic building.

Changing the texture and patina of character-defining features through sandblasting or use of other abrasive methods to remove paint, discoloration or plaster. This includes both exposed wood (including structural members) and masonry.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of interior features and finishes.

Replacing an entire interior feature such as a staircase, paneled wall, parquet floor, or cornice; or finish such as a decorative wall covering or ceiling when repair of materials and limited replacement of such parts are appropriate.

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

Removing a character-defining feature or finish that is unreparable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature or finish 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 physical, historical, and pictorial documentation or on information derived from another building.

Introducing a new interior feature or finish that is incompatible with the scale, design, materials, color, and texture of the surviving interior features and finishes.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Dividing rooms, lowering ceilings, and damaging or obscuring character-defining features such as fireplaces, niches, stairways or alcoves, so that a new use can be accommodated in the building.

Discarding historic material when it can be reused within the rehabilitation project or relocating it in historically inappropriate areas.

Installing permanent partitions that damage or obscure character-defining spaces, features, or finishes.

Enclosing an interior stairway with fire-rated construction so that the stairwell space or any character-defining features are destroyed.

Radically changing, damaging, or destroying character-defining spaces, features, or finishes when adding new code-required stairways and elevators.

Destroying character-defining interior spaces, features, or finishes; or damaging the structural system in order to create an atrium or light well.

Inserting a new floor within a building that alters or destroys the fenestration; radically changes a character-defining interior space; or obscures, damages, or destroys decorative detailing.

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.

New Additions to Historic Buildings

Recommended:

Placing functions and services required for the new use in non-character defining interior spaces rather than installing a new addition.

Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an inconspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

Designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.

Considering the attached exterior addition both in terms of the new use and the appearance of other buildings in the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building. In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.

Placing new additions such as balconies and greenhouses on non character defining elevations and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

Designing additional stories, when required for the new use, that are set back from the wall plane and are as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.

Not Recommended:

Expanding the size of the historic building by constructing a new addition when the new use could be met by altering non character defining interior spaces.

Attaching a new addition so that the character defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

Designing a new addition so that its size and scale in relation to the historic building are out of proportion, thus diminishing the historic character.

Duplicating the exact form, material, style, and detailing of the historic building in the new addition so that the new work appears to be part of the historic building.

Imitating a historic style or period of architecture in new additions, especially for contemporary uses such as drive in banks or garages.

Designing and constructing new additions that result in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the resource, including its design, materials, workmanship, location, or setting.

Using the same wall plane, roof line, cornice height, materials, siding lap or window type to make additions appear to be a part of the historic building.

Designing new additions such as multistory greenhouse additions that obscure, damage, or destroy character defining features of the historic building.

Constructing additional stories so that the historic appearance of the building is radically changed.

D. ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED CHANGES

Restoration of the Shubert Theater stage house

Replacing the stage house is consistent with the Standards that call for identifying and preserving features important in defining overall building character. The proposed stage house replicates the original that is based on sufficient historic, pictorial, and physical documentation. However, the proposed exterior material does deviate from the replication of original materials.

Cladding the stage house with proposed stucco material is not consistent with the Standards that call for replacing in kind a feature of the building that is being recreated. In addition to the Standards, staff reviewed Preservation Brief #16 The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors to examine whether stucco would be an appropriate replacement for brick. The National Park Service indicates there are four circumstances that would warrant the use of substitute building materials (Attachments, page A72-A98). They include the following: 1) the unavailability of original materials, 2) the unavailability of skilled craftspersons, 3) inherent flaws in the original materials, and 4) code-required changes.

The four-mentioned circumstances are not the present situation for the Shubert stage house. The original stage house had a cream-colored common brick material as the exterior material. A brick, or an appropriate masonry alternative, should be used for the re-creation of the Shubert Theater stage house.

Shubert Theater Exterior

The restoration of the exterior of the Shubert Theater is consistent with the Standards for masonry, windows, and entrances. Original features such as the decorative terra cotta are being restored. The second story windows are being reinstalled and are replicating the original window pattern with a historically accurate window. The entrance doors are being replaced with historically accurate design. Detracting from the use of appropriate in kind or substitute materials is that the Shubert Theater doors will be only used for exiting purposes, which is not consistent with the Standards that call for entrances to retain their historic functions. Despite the entrance function, the proposed exterior work to the Shubert is consistent with the Standards that call for character defining masonry and window features to be preserved.

Shubert Theater Interior

In the past, the Shubert Theater interior has not been reviewed to the standards that the exterior has been reviewed. The unusual Council actions for local designation give unclear direction about interior designation and there is little remaining interior fabric. However, the balconies are an integral feature of the Shubert Theater and staff is applying the Standards to the interior changes.

The removal of the balconies is not consistent with a number of the Standards that call for retaining and preserving original building features that are important in defining the overall character of the building. The Standards for Interior Spaces and Site specifically call for the retention of character defining spaces, including interior. As indicated in the nomination form, the Shubert is the last remaining tow-balcony theater in Minneapolis.

The applicants have submitted a narrative that briefly explains the reasoning for the removal of the balconies that includes conflicts with structural capacities and modern building code requirements. However, these issues are at odds with the Standards that call for failing to undertaking measure to assure the preservation of interior features. The building has remained vacant for approximately eight years at its present location and this type of structural investigation has only been submitted with this

application. The proposal that was approved by the HPC in November 2007, included the retention of the balconies and described no such structural conditions of the balconies.

Staff recognizes that the Shubert's innovation design in 1910 contributes to the current proposal to remove the balconies. The lack of interior columns to support the balconies does provide unobstructed sight lines and acoustics, however, without columns the balconies have a delicate structural relationship to the stability of the exterior walls. Technical documentation such as clear interior elevation drawings and structural analysis are common application materials that staff has asked for this application to fully review the balconies. Failure of the applicant to provide more technical documents is not consistent with the Standards that call for undertaking measures to assure the preservation of interior features.

Preservation standards and practices call for retaining one of the last interior remnants of the Shubert Theater, despite the current proposal. Previous remodels and the 1999 move have stripped the Shubert of much of the historic integrity expected of a Minneapolis landmark. The Shubert Theater no longer retains its original location or setting, and the design, materials and workmanship qualities of the building have been lost due to remodels and the 1999 move. The interior of the theater has undergone significant loss of fabric, including the lobby, box seating, decorative plaster, and stage house. The façade and the interior configuration of the balconies are the remaining features of the building that represent the authenticity of what this building has been in the past.

The Shubert Theater will maintain little historic integrity without the balconies. The structure retains some of its authenticity as a theater due in part to the existence of the balconies. While not required to reuse the balconies as seating areas, the balconies of the Shubert Theater be retained.

The applicant is not proposing to recreate the decorative plasterwork, however, there are two existing plaster columns that flank the proscenium that will be restored. Interior elevations were not provided as part of the application. Elevation plans of the interior should also be reviewed for consistency with the Standards.

New construction

The new infill construction is consistent with the Standards that call for new construction to be compatible with the historic relationship of surrounding historic buildings. In this case, the new construction is built up to the property line like the Shubert and the Hennepin Center for the Arts. The new construction also exhibits similar patterns as the adjacent structures, such as the ground floor entrances and the lobby areas. The window patterns of the Hennepin Center for the Arts and the Shubert have more patterned rhythm than the new construction; however, the second story window is centered on the building, which is a consistent feature of the three structures.

The height and the massing of the infill addition is a smaller building compared to the Shubert and the Hennepin Center for the Arts. The change in scale between the three-story Shubert and nine-story Hennepin Center for the Arts is not consistent with the Standards that call for adjacent to new additions to preserve the relationship between buildings. A taller addition that meets the height of the Shubert is more consistent with the Standards. The addition should be a minimum of three stories or that the cosmetic mesh screen be similar in height to the three-story Shubert.

The proposed mesh screen over the façade of the new construction is a unique building material. The proposed screen projects past the corners of both the Shubert and the Hennepin Center for the Arts. This is not consistent with the Standards that do not recommend that character-defining features of the historic building are obscured. The mesh screen should not project over the edges of the Shubert Theater or the Hennepin Center for the Arts.

E. FINDINGS:

1. The Shubert Theater is designated a local historic landmark and listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The National Register nomination includes the interior designation of the Shubert Theater.
2. The Hennepin Center for the Arts, also known as the Masonic Temple, is designated a local historic landmark and listed in the National Register of Historic Places.
3. The restoration to the terracotta on the exterior of the Shubert Theater restoration is consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation (the “Standards”) in that the original features will be retained.
4. Reinstalling the second story windows on the Shubert Theater is consistent with the Standards in that the applicants are replicating the original windows pattern with a historically accurate restoration.
5. Reinstalling the entrance doors of the Shubert Theater is consistent with the Standards in identifying and replicating the historic door design.
6. Using the Shubert Theater doors for exiting purposes only is not consist with the Standards that call for entrances to retain their historic function as entrances.
7. As indicated in the nomination forms, the Shubert Theater is the last remaining two-balcony theater in Minneapolis. The balconies are one of the last remaining authentic interior features of the theater. The HPC approved a project in November 2007 that included the retention of the balconies.
8. The removal of the balconies is not consistent with the Standards that call for retaining and preserving original features that are important in defining the overall character of the building. The Standards for Interior Spaces and Site specifically call for retention of spaces, including interior that are important in the overall character of the building.
9. The applicants are proposing to remove the interior balconies due to conflicts between the structural capacity and modern building codes. This is not consistent with the Standards that call for undertaking measures to assure the preservation of interior features.
10. The Shubert Theater retains little historic integrity of a theater without the interior balconies. The balconies of the Shubert Theater be retained, however, the balconies are not required to be used for seating. Structural evidence was not submitted to indicate any non-seating alternatives were considered.
11. Replacing the Stage House is consistent with the Standards that call for identifying and preserving features important in defining its overall character. The new Stage House is a replica of the original size, which is based on sufficient historic, pictorial, and physical documentation.
12. Cladding the stage house with stucco is not consistent with the Standards that call for replacing in kind a feature of the building that is being recreated. Stucco is not a compatible substitute material for brick. Brick, or a suitable masonry alterative should be used on the recreation of the stage house.

13. Replacing the Shubert Theater sign is consistent with the City's Design Guidelines for On-Premise Signs and Awnings for restoring historic signs and the Standards for preserving character-defining features such as signage. The new signs are also consistent with the City's Design Guidelines for On-Premise Signs and Awnings for restoring historic signs and the Standards that call for new construction to differentiate from the old.
14. The new infill construction is consistent with the Standards that call for new construction to be compatible with the historic relationship of surrounding historic buildings. In this case, the new construction is built up to the property line like the Shubert and the Hennepin Center for the Arts.
15. The height and massing of the infill construction is a smaller building compared to the Shubert and the Hennepin Center for the Arts. The change in scale between the three-story Shubert and the nine-story Hennepin Center for the Art is not consistent with the Standards that call for adjacent new additions to preserve the relationships between buildings. A taller addition that meets the height of the Shubert is more consistent with the Standards. The addition should be a minimum of three-stories or that the cosmetic mesh screen be similar in height to the three-story Shubert Theater.

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the HPC **adopt** staff findings and **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness for the rehabilitation of the Shubert Theater, modifications to the Hennepin Center for the Arts, new building construction between the two buildings, and a building addition to rear of the Shubert Theater, subject to the following conditions:

1. Brick, or an appropriate masonry alternative, is used on the recreation of the Shubert Theater stage house.
2. The balconies of the Shubert Theater are retained.
3. The new infill construction along Hennepin Avenue must increase the height of the structure to three stories or increase the height of the mesh screen to terminate at the third story of the Shubert Theater
4. The mesh screen on the infill construction will not cover the façade of the Shubert Theater or the Hennepin Center for the Arts.
5. Final drawings including site plan, elevations and details shall be reviewed and approved by Heritage Preservation Commission.

Attachments:

Submitted by applicant:

Certificate of Appropriateness applications, pages A1-A2

Project Description and Statement of Use: A3-A4

Site Plan, A5

Building elevation plans, A6-A9

Floor plans, A10-A14

Rendering of new infill construction, A14-A15b

Window specification, A16-A21

Interior Photographs, A22-A26

Submitted by CPED-staff:

Heritage Preservation Commission Actions, November 6, 2007, A27-A28

City Council, Actions 9/15/1990, A29-A32

Local Heritage Preservation Designation Study of the Shubert Theater, A33-A35

National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form, Shubert Theater, A36-A73

Documentation of the Proposed Relocation of the Sam. S. Shubert Theater, A74-A77
National Park Service, Preservation Brief #16, The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building
Exteriors, A78-A92