

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

FILE NAME: 1022 University Avenue, Florence Court (individual residential structures)
DATE OF APPLICATION: June 18, 2008
APPLICANTS: Clark Gassen, CAG Development
PUBLICATION DATE: August 5, 2008
DATE OF HEARING: August 12, 2008
END OF APPEAL PERIOD: August 22, 2008
HPC SITE/DISTRICT: Florence Court Apartments, Individual Landmark
CATEGORY: Non-contributing
CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness for removal/demolition of five non-contributing structures
STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Molly McCartney, (612) 673-5811

A. SITE DESCRIPTION & BACKGROUND:

1022 University Avenue Southeast is a multi-building site that contains six residential structures, including one large apartment building, Florence Court. Florence Court is a local historic landmark that was designated in 1983. There are five non-contributing, freestanding residential structures on the parcel that are the subjects of this report. As part of a proposed redevelopment plan, the five non-contributing, freestanding residential structures, and one detached garage, are proposed to be moved or demolished to make way for a new multi-family structure. The following report details the history of the local designation, the background of these subject structures, and an analysis of the removal/demolition request.

In addition to the Florence Court parcel, there are two other properties on this block. On the northwest corner there is a service station and on the east end of the block is a contract parking lot for the University of Minnesota.

History of the local designation

The Florence Court parcel is unique in that a historically designated structure is located on the same tax parcel as other structures that do not have the same protection. When Florence Court was designated in 1983, the nomination from staff recommended that all the structures on the site be designated. At that time, the City Planning Commission reviewed designations and the CPC recommended that Heritage Preservation Commission adopt a recommendation that only the L-shaped apartment building, known as Florence Court, be designated. That recommendation was adopted by the City Council (per 599.260¹). See attached Council resolution page 88.

The designation of Florence Court noted that the property was an example of one of the oldest apartment buildings in Minneapolis and that the inward focus of the development on a courtyard was a unique design associated with community planning. The designation of the Florence Court apartment building

¹ In 1983, the corresponding ordinance section was Chapter 34.40

does include the landscape of the interior courtyard – without the courtyard, Florence Court would not have the significance in which it was originally recognized for through historic designation. The other buildings on the site are considered non-contributing resources to this local historic landmark; however they have consistent building placement focusing inward to the courtyard in a “U” shaped pattern around the property.

Since the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation ordinance has been updated since 1983, the current design criteria that the site design could be nominated for include the follow three criteria:

- *Criteria one: The property is associated with significant events or with periods that exemplify broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history.*
- *Criteria four: The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural or engineering type or style, or method of construction.*
- *Criteria five: The property exemplifies a landscape design or development pattern distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness or quality of design or detail.*

In addition to the significant of the design of the property, the property could have also been eligible under today’s Criteria two for the persons associated with the property.

Background of the residential structures

Since the time of designation, CPED-Planning staff has treated the subject five structures like non-contributing structures in a historic district. Some building records have been retained in the landmark files; however, alterations to these buildings have not come under review of the HPC. The current proposal for these non-contributing structures is being reviewed by staff and the HPC because the entire property is protected by the local designation. The non-contributing structures do have significance to the designated building due to their location around the courtyard and the site’s unique landscape features (which are a major reason for the designation of Florence Court) have the potential to be negatively impacted by the proposed site changes.

There are five, freestanding residential structures on the site, with only one being an original building to the site. Four of the homes were moved to the site in the 1920s and 1940s. There is one large residential structure that was built on the site at its present location. Because the site is one tax parcel, the addressing of these structures has fluctuated over time, and in this report will be referred to as numbers, and not necessarily their mailing or street address. This is consistent with the numbering of the site from the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) – Nomination Form. Please see map on page 127 of the site for their corresponding numbers. The following is a description of these homes, along with building permit history.

No. 19

This home is located in the rear, or southern end of the property, just east of the Florence Court apartment building. This home is a vernacular, one and one-half story, wood frame home with a main gable roof with gable dormer. It has rectangular sash windows and a symmetrical façade. The home faces the interior of the site and there is an open front porch across the façade. This home was moved to the site in 1921 from 327 15th Avenue Southeast, at the southwest corner of 15th Avenue Southeast and 4th Street Southeast in the area now known as Dinkytown. Historic city records indicate that the structure may have been a depot prior to being converted to a dwelling. City records do not show when the structure was actually built, however they do indicate that a foundation permit was obtained in 1901 and that an addition and alteration was also done to the dwelling in 1901. The NRHP – Nomination Form indicates that the home was construction in 1880, but there is no supporting information found in that nomination or in the City Preservation files for this property. Sanborn maps from 1912 indicate that

the structure was used as a dwelling at its previous location of 327 15th Avenue Southeast. Josiah Chase was the property owner of Florence Court as well as the owner listed on the building permits for 327 15th Avenue Southeast. Josiah Chase was a long time owner of the Florence Court property starting in 1921.

No. 20

This home is located in the rear, southeast corner of the property, to the east of No 19. This home is similar in style to No. 19 in that it is also a one and one-half story, wood frame home with a main gable roof with two gable dormers. It has rectangular sash windows but is different in that it has an asymmetrical façade. The home faces the interior of the site and there is an open front porch that wraps around the façade. This home was moved to the site in 1921 from 325 15th Avenue Southeast, which is adjacent to 327 15th Avenue Southeast and the second house south of the southwest corner of 15th Avenue Southeast and 4th Street Southeast. Historic city records indicate that the structure was a dwelling at that location. City records do not show when the home was actually built, however they do indicate that a foundation permit was obtained in 1903 and that plumbing permits were obtained for this address in 1903. The NRHP Nomination Form indicates that the home was constructed in 1870, but there is no supporting information found in that nomination or in the City Preservation files for this property. Sanborn maps from 1912 indicate that the structure was used as a dwelling at its previous location of 325 15th Avenue Southeast. Josiah Chase was also the property owner of Florence Court as well as the owner listed on the building permits for 325 15th Avenue Southeast.

No. 25

No. 25 is located to the north of No. 20 on the east side of the property and also faces the interior of the site. This home is a one and one-half story, wood frame home with a main gable roof with side facing two gable dormers. The home has lap siding on the first floor and wood shingles as the dominant exterior material on the half story. The windows are rectangular sash windows and the home has an asymmetrical façade with a small open entry porch. The shingles on the half story terminate at the first story with coved details. Based on historic city building permits, this home was moved to the site in 1945 from 200 Harvard Street Southeast, which was at the southwest corner of Harvard Street and Beacon Street Southeast, which is now the Washington Avenue Parking Ramp at the University of Minnesota, East Bank Campus. Historic city records indicate that the structure was a dwelling at that location. City records show that the home was built in 1887 which is also identified on the NRHP Nomination Form. Sanborn maps from 1912 indicate that the structure was used as a dwelling at its previous location of 200 Harvard Street Southeast.

No. 27

No. 27 is located to the north of No. 25 on the east side of the property and also faces the interior of the site. It is a two-story, Modified Colonial Revival style home, with a main open gable. It is clad in lap siding, has a symmetrical façade, rectangular sash windows, and a lunette window with radiating wood muntins and keystone in the upper gable. It has a porch across the façade that was likely open at one time, but now is enclosed. This home was moved to the site in 1945 from 501 Beacon Street Southeast, which was at the northeast corner of Beacon Street Southeast and Union Street Southeast, which is now open space across from the Washington Avenue Parking Ramp at the University of Minnesota, East Bank Campus. Historic city records do not indicate what year the structure was built, however the NRHP nomination form shows that it was built in 1900. Sanborn maps from 1912 indicate that the structure was used as a dwelling at its previous location of 200 Harvard Street Southeast.

No. 1018

This is the only residential structure, besides Florence Court, that stands in its original location. No. 1018, also known as 1018 University Avenue Southeast, was built in 1886. It is a two and one-half story building, with a red brick veneer and cement-faced limestone foundation. It is a Queen Anne style home, with a gambrel roof with intersecting side gables, first and second story bay windows on the north façade, an angled bay window on the northeast corner of the first floor, and large open front porch. Most windows are rectangular sash windows, with the exception of stained-glass transom windows above the northeast corner bay on the first floor. The home has been significantly altered including siding on the open gambrel half story, some window replacement, changes to porch features like the columns and suffers from a general lack of maintenance as evidence in the sagging rear porches, window disrepair, and the brick veneer falling away from the frame. The interior as well shows wear over time, including heavily reinforced basement structural supports. The home was re-roofed in 2005.

This is only structure on the site that has a strong significance to the architectural style and developer of the Florence Court apartments. Historical records indicate that the developer and builder of Florence Court, Jeremiah Spears, also built this house for this family and that they lived there for a short time while operating the apartments. The home does have some architectural similarities to Florence Court; brick veneers, gambrel roof lines, and front porches. The other homes on the site are not original to the site.

The applicants have stated that they intend to demolish this building, as opposed to moving it, and use the exterior brick for repair on the Florence Court Apartment building because this home and the apartment building have similar color and patina.

B. PROPOSED CHANGES & ANALYSIS:

The Florence Court redevelopment proposal includes the rehabilitation of the Florence Court Apartments (b.1886), demolition of five residential structures, and construction of a new multi-family apartment building. While the apartment building is the only locally designated structure on the site, the same parcel of land contains five additional non-contributing, residential buildings. Four of these buildings are not original to the site and were moved in the 1920s and 1940s by subsequent owners. One building, No. 1018, was built at the type of Florence Court by the same owner, Jeremiah Spears, and has similar Queen Anne architectural details as the apartment building. Florence Court was locally designated for its association with early community planning and not for its architectural style or persons associated with the property. However, this analysis uses the above mentioned criteria for designation to fully analysis the proposed removal/demolition.

The proposed new construction is a four-story, apartment building, which would be located on the east side of the parcel. The new construction is being reviewed because the entire parcel is captured in the designation and the interior courtyard plays a significant role in the property's historic significance. Florence Court is noted for being one of the oldest surviving apartment buildings in Minneapolis, as well as its original planning concept of row houses located around an interior courtyard.

While the freestanding buildings are not part of the designated structure, they do contribute to the landscape because of their orientation to the interior courtyard. The four buildings that were moved to the site fulfill the original planning concept because they do face inward; however, there is variation in the consistency of their site layout. While No. 19 and No. 20 have similar front building faces, the facades of No. 25 and No. 27 are not in line. No. 1018 faces University Avenue Southeast, which is the original location of the structure.

In addition to contributing to the overall site layout, these buildings also have associations with the lives of significant persons or groups. No. 1018 was built by Spears and used by the family for the short time he owned the property. The four houses moved to the site are associated with Josiah Chase, property owner of Florence Court, an attorney a Minneapolis alderman (Ward 2) for almost 25 years. These homes represent a historical trend of relocating houses instead of merely demolishing them for redevelopment.

No. 1018 has the most architectural connections to Florence Court, in the original Queen Anne design. There is no record of any planned intentions of the architecture of these building; however, the unique roof lines, exterior brick, window patterns, and porches show similarities. In addition, this building appears to be built during the same period of significance. While the other four buildings do not share architectural features, there is building permit information that No. 25 and N. 27 were built during a similar time period.

C. SIGNIFICANCE

Section 599.350 of the Heritage Preservation code requires that before the destruction, in whole or in part, of any landmark, property in an historic district, or nominated property under interim protection, the commission shall make findings that the destruction is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property, or that there are no reasonable alternatives to the destruction. In determining whether reasonable alternatives exist, the commission shall consider, but not be limited to, the significance of the property, the integrity of the property and the economic value or usefulness of the existing structure, including its current use, costs of renovation and feasible alternative uses. These are similar requirements for another type of preservation application, the Demolition of a Historic Resource.

1. Demolition is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property

The applicant has supplied information about the current structural state of No. 1018. A structural report and cost estimate were supplied. The report includes the details of fixing the exterior brick, and stabilizing the foundations and interior structural support. The report does detail that these repairs are needed to correct an unsafe or dangerous property condition. The cost for these repairs has been estimated at between \$500,000 and \$600,000. It appears that significant repairs need to be made to the home or the lack of maintenance will result in an unsafe property condition.

2. There are no reasonable alternatives to the demolition. In determining whether reasonable alternatives exist, the commission shall consider, but not be limited to, the significance of the property, the integrity of the property and the economic value or usefulness of the existing structure, including its current use, costs of renovation and feasible alternative uses.

The significance of the property

Of the five structures, No. 1018 has the most significance to the designated apartment building in terms of connections to the period of significance, architectural details, and association with the developer. However, these connections are not the original reason for designating Florence Court. The other four buildings that were moved to the site, however they do seem to have stronger connections to the reason for the designation of Florence Court, in that they are oriented to the interior courtyard like the apartment building. They also have connections to another significant person in Minneapolis history,

Josiah Chase. It is possible that new construction could also have a sensitive architectural design as well as respect the landscape and site layout.

The integrity² of the property

The non-contributing buildings at the Florence Court site do contribute to the integrity of the landmark, in that they support the buildings' focus on the interior of the site. No. 1018 also contributes to the local landmark in that it was built during the time of significance (1186-1887) and there are strong connections between the architectural styles and original developer.

Economic value or usefulness of the existing structure

The applicant has supplied information about the costs to renovate the designated Florence Court apartment building, and has stated the reason for the demolition is for the new construction to help finance the costs of rehabilitating Florence Court. In addition, the applicant has also supplied a report on the historical and architectural significance of the freestanding buildings. That report finds that No. 1018 has the highest level of significance to the apartment buildings. The application also documents that No. 1018 also has the highest costs of rehabilitation. From the submitted materials, the applicant estimates that the rehab of Florence Court would be approximately \$2 million dollars, while the rehab of No. 1018 would be between \$500,000 and \$600,000, over a quarter of the budget to repair the historically designated Florence Court.

In addition to using the COA's requirements for demolition, staff also considered what the other applications for this site. Staff also considered the proposed rehabilitation of major portions of the designated apartment building, treatment of the landscape, and the design of the new construction.

Staff recommends that the request for removal/demolition be granted for the five-noncontributing structures at 1022 University Avenue Southeast. This recommendation is based on the finding that demolition is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property at No. 1018. The estimated cost to rehabilitate this building is a quarter of the estimated cost of rehabilitation of Florence Court, as submitted by the applicant. The recommendation is also based on the findings that buildings No. 19, 20, 25, and 27 are not part of the original development and were moved to the site over 30 years after the period of significance in which Florence Court is noted and that there is a variable interior building face among these structures. However, they do not detract from the significant landscape feature of the interior courtyard. The following mitigation measures will help to ensure that new development respects the significant landscape feature of the courtyard.

Mitigation Plan

The HPC may require a mitigation plan as a condition of any approval for demolition associated with a Certificate of Appropriateness. Such plan may include the documentation of the property by measured drawings, photographic recording, historical research or other means appropriate to the significance of the property. Such plan also may include the salvage and preservation of specified building materials, architectural details, ornaments, fixtures and similar items for use in restoration elsewhere. Additional conditions of approval are allowed as well.

Staff recommends that mitigation measures submitted by the applicant be a condition of approval for the demolition, to include the following:

² *Integrity*. The authenticity of a landmark, historic district, nominated property under interim protection or historic resource evidenced by its location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling or association. 599.110

1. The buildings should be documented for the Minnesota Historic Property Record, including a documentation set of 4 in. by 5 in. black and white negatives, 4 in. by 5 in. black and white contact prints, an index of the photographs, and a brief narrative of the Campus Theater and Oak Street Cinema, all on archival appropriate mediums. The set of documentation should be distributed to the following:
 - Minnesota Historical Society, including digital copies
 - Minneapolis Public Library
 - One community library (Southeast Como)
 - Northwest Architectural Archives at the University of Minnesota
 - City of Minneapolis, CPED-Planning, Historic Preservation, including digital copies
 - One set to the developer
2. Any new construction must not develop the traditional interior courtyard. This includes limiting the amount of parking and paving surface to be included in the courtyard. A detailed landscape plan, including existing and proposed species shall be submitted to the Heritage Preservation Commission prior to submitting moving or demolition permit.
3. New construction shall respect the original design's focus on the interior courtyard and have orientation to the courtyard, as well as primary entrances on the courtyard. Addition entrances on other elevations are not prohibited.
4. Per the applicant's suggestion, all attempts shall be made to move the structures from the site prior to demolition. Removal or demolition of the subject buildings may not occur until the site has received all necessary City approvals, including, but not limited to, approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction at this site from the Heritage Preservation Commission and the City Planning Commission.

D. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:

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

Building Site

Recommended:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Design for Missing Historic Features

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

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

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

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

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

Not Recommended:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Design for Missing Historic Features

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

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

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

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

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

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

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

E. FINDINGS:

1. The Florence Court Apartment Building, or Florence Court, located at 1022 University Avenue Southeast, is a local historic landmark. The apartment building was designated historic in 1983.
2. 1022 University Avenue Southeast is a multi-building site that contains six residential structures, including one large apartment building, Florence Court. There are five other residential structures on the parcel that Florence Court is located on, which are referred to as No. 19, No. 20, No. 25, No. 27, and No. 1018. These buildings are not currently designated.
3. As part of a proposed redevelopment plan, the five non-contributing freestanding residential structures, and one detached garage, are proposed to be moved or demolished to make way for a new multi-family structure.
4. While the freestanding buildings are not part of the designated structure, they do contribute to the landscape because of their orientation to the interior courtyard. The four buildings that were moved to the site fulfill the original planning concept because they do face inward; however, there is variation in the consistency of their site layout. While No. 19 and No. 20 have similar front building faces, the facades of No. 25 and No. 27 are not in line. No. 1018 faces University Avenue Southeast, which is the original location of the structure.
5. The subject buildings also have associations with the lives of significant persons. No. 1018 was built by Spears and used by the family for the short time he owned the property. The four houses moved to the site are associated with Josiah Chase, property owner of Florence Court, an attorney a Minneapolis alderman (Ward 2) for almost 25 years. These homes represent a historical trend of relocating houses instead of demolishing them for redevelopment.
6. No. 1018 has the most architectural connections to Florence Court, in the original Queen Anne design. There is no record of any planned intentions of the architecture of these building; however, the unique roof lines, exterior brick, window patterns, and porches show similarities. This building

appears to be built during the same period of significance of the designated structure. The other four buildings do not share architectural features; however, No. 25 and N. 27 were built during a similar time period.

7. Demolition is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property at No. 1018. Structural reports indicate that a historic lack of maintenance of the building has resulted in unsafe conditions. The estimated cost to rehabilitate this building is a quarter of the estimated cost of rehabilitation of Florence Court, as submitted by the applicant. It appears that significant repairs need to be made to the home or the lack of maintenance will result in an unsafe property condition.
8. The of the five structures, No. 1018 has the most significance to the designated apartment building in terms of connections to the period of significance, architectural details, and association with the developer. The other four buildings that were moved to the site have fewer connections in that they are oriented to the interior courtyard like the apartment building continuing the original interior-focused design that the structure is noted for in its designation nomination and that they have connections to another significant person in Minneapolis history, Josiah Chase. It is possible that new construction could also have a sensitive architectural design as well as respect the landscape and site layout.
9. The non-contributing buildings at the Florence Court site do contribute to the integrity of the landmark, in that they support the buildings' focus on the interior of the site. No. 1018 also contributes to the local landmark in that there are strong connections between the architectural styles and original developer.
10. The applicant has stated the reason for the demolition is for the new construction to help finance the costs of rehabilitating Florence Court. The applicant has also supplied a report on the historical and architectural significance of the freestanding buildings. The finding from that report detail that No. 1018 has the highest level of significance to the apartment buildings. The application also documents that No. 1018 also has the highest costs of rehabilitation. From the submitted materials, the applicant estimates that the rehab of Florence Court would be approximately \$2 million dollars, while the rehab of No. 1018 would be between \$500,000 and \$600,000, over a quarter of the budget to repair the historically designated Florence Court.
11. Staff recommends that the request for removal/demolition be granted for the five-noncontributing structures at 1022 University Avenue Southeast. This recommendation is based on the finding that demolition is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property at No. 1018 and that buildings No. 19, 20, 25, and 27 are not part of the original development and were moved to the site over 30 years after the period of significance in which Florence Court is noted and that there is a variable interior building face among these structures. However, they do not detract from the significant landscape feature of the interior courtyard. The following mitigation measures will help to ensure that new development respects the significant landscape feature of the courtyard.
12. The Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation call for identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character. Removal of the structures is not consistent with this guideline in that the buildings that face the interior courtyard will be removed.

13. While the removal or demolition of the subject buildings will result in the loss of buildings that have historical significance to the Florence Court apartments, however, staff recommends approval of this application, with conditions, because of the loss of integrity of No. 1018 and that the four buildings moved to the site contribute to the overall site condition because of their orientation to the courtyard.

F. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the HPC adopt staff findings and **approve** a Certificate of Appropriateness to move or demolish the following structure at 1022 University Avenue Southeast, No. 19, No. 20, No. 25, No. 27, and No. 1018, subject to the following conditions:

1. The buildings should be documented for the Minnesota Historic Property Record, including a documentation set of 4 in. by 5 in. black and white negatives, 4 in. by 5 in. black and white contact prints, an index of the photographs, and a brief narrative of the Campus Theater and Oak Street Cinema, all on archival appropriate mediums. The set of documentation should be distributed to the following:
 - Minnesota Historical Society, including digital copies
 - Minneapolis Public Library
 - One community library, Southeast Como
 - Northwest Architectural Archives at the University of Minnesota
 - City of Minneapolis, CPED-Planning, Historic Preservation, including digital copies
 - One set to the developer
2. Any new construction on the site must not develop the traditional “U” shaped interior courtyard. This includes limiting the amount of parking and paving surface to be included in the courtyard. A detailed landscape plan, including existing and proposed species shall be submitted to the Heritage Preservation Commission prior to any moving or demolition permit.
3. New construction shall respect the original design’s focus on the interior courtyard and have orientation to the courtyard, as well as primary entrances on the courtyard. Addition entrances on other elevations are not prohibited.
4. Structures may not moved or demolished until all necessary City approvals are granted, including, but not limited to, approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction at this site from the Heritage Preservation Commission and the City Planning Commission, and Development Review.
5. Final drawings including plans, elevations and details shall be reviewed and approved by the Heritage Preservation Commission.

G. ATTACHMETNS

- I. Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness and Historic Variance, pages 1-7
 - A. Rehabilitation of Florence Court, pages 8-10
 - B. New Construction, page 11
 - C. Removal/Demolition of five residential structures, pages 12-19
 - D. Historic variance to allow two principal residential structures
- II. Land Use study of Florence Court and Adjacent Property, prepared by Hess, Roise, and Company, pages 20-36
- III. Description of Rehabilitation Work of Florence Court, pages 37-57
- IV. Structural reports (including photographs) for No. 1018, pages 58-75

- V. Site plan, elevation drawings and renderings of proposed redevelopment
 - A. Existing site plan, page 76
 - B. Florence Court floor plans, pages 77-80
 - C. Florence Court elevation drawings, pages 81-82
 - D. Proposed site plan with new construction and landscape changes, page 83
 - E. Elevation drawings of the proposed new construction and renderings, pages 84-87
- VI. City Council Actions, July 15, 198, in regards to the local historic designation of Florence Court, page 88
- VII. National Register of Historic Places – Nomination Form for Florence Court, 89-105
- VIII. Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps for No. 19, No. 20, No. 25, and No. 27, 106-107
- IX. Building permit histories for No. 19, No. 20, No. 25, No. 27, and No. 1018
- X. Correspondence received, pages 108-126
- XI. Map of Florence court, page 127