

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

FILE NAME: 500 3rd Street North (BZH 25787)

CATEGORY/DISTRICT: Minneapolis Warehouse National Historic District (Interim Protection) and Individual Landmark Designation

CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness

APPLICANT: David J. Kelly and Phillip Koski on behalf of 500, LLC

COMPLETE APPLICATION: May 6, 2009

PUBLICATION DATE: May 26, 2009

DATE OF HEARING: June 2, 2009

APPEAL PERIOD EXPIRATION : June 12, 2009

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

REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness for Rehabilitation and New Addition Project

A. SITE DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND:

District/Area Information	
Historic District	National Register Warehouse District: Interim Protection (Contributing Structure).
Period of Significance	Circa 1865-1930
Individual Landmark	Nominated for Consideration as a local landmark by the Heritage Preservation on December 2, 2008.
Neighborhood	North Loop
Historic Property Information	
Address	500 3 rd Street North
Construction Date	1908
Original Contractor	Jason Leck Company
Original Architect	Claude Allen Porter (C.A.P.) Turner
Historical Use	Grocery Warehouse
Historic Name	Green and DeLaittre Company Wholesale Grocery Warehouse Building
Current Use	Vacant
Proposed Use	Office on second through fourth floors and parking on the first floor and basement

Exterior: The Green & DeLaittre Company Wholesale Grocery Warehouse Building at 500 North 3rd Street is a four-story rectangular brick building. It was built in 1908 and designed by architect and engineer Claude Allen Porter (C.A.P.) Turner. Three elevations, the east, south, and west were finished in relatively the same manner. The building along these elevations has a corbelled cornice. The first story contains a loading dock and likely contains the original window and door openings. The upper stories' openings on the west and south elevation are paired in the corner bays and organized as single units in the middle bays. The east elevation varies slightly in that the corner bays are single window units. This building is a contributing structure to the National Register of Historic Places Warehouse District.

Interior: The building's brick façade does not reveal its revolutionary structural system. C.A. P. Turner designed this property with the mushroom capitals that support a slab with no dropped beams. Considering the modest size of the building, these largely closely-spaced columns suggest an experimental design (Source: (Source: National Register of Historic Places Designation Form).

- Concrete flat-slab construction is a reinforced concrete slab supported directly by concrete columns without the use of girders or intermediate beams spanning between the columns. The benefits of the concrete flat-slab design compared to concrete systems that contain girders and intermediate beams include the following:
- Improved fire protection by reducing the number of sprinkler heads required and allowing more latitude in their placement;
- Lowered floor-to-floor heights, and the cost savings associated with less cladding and column construction;
- Provided better illumination from windows and overhead lights; More advantageous placing of shafts and other floor openings than with traditional beam framing;
- Reduced unusable space; allowed for greater amount of usable space;
- Reduced floor framing depths
- Eliminated the expanse of formed beams on the underside of the floor.

C.A.P. Turner has received national recognition with his mushroom-slab design and contributions to concrete flat-slab construction. In 2002, Turner's Marshall Building (1907) in Milwaukee, WI was dedicated as a national historic civil engineering landmark for being the world's oldest extant example of a flat-slab concrete building (see Appendix B18).

The Green and DeLaittre Company Wholesale Grocery Warehouse Building is likely the earliest extant example in Minneapolis of a building built and designed by C.A.P. Turner with the flat slab reinforced concrete design (Source: National Register of Historic Places Designation Form and Appendix B19 and B20). Minneapolis is recognized as having the first building with the concrete reinforced concrete design, that being, the Johnson-Bovely Company Building located at 426 2nd Avenue South, however, this building was torn down in 1975.

Character-Defining Features of the Building: The character-defining facades of the building are the east, south, and west exterior elevations. Each elevation is finished in relatively the same manner and are clearly visible from the right-of-way. The character-defining features of this building on these elevations include the following:

- Masonry
- Entrances
- Windows
- Loading docks
- Fire escape
- Canopies
- Rooftop Features Chimney/Elevator Penthouse
- Building Site
- (and Interior)

C. APPLICATION BACKGROUND

Land Use: On September 22, 2008, the Applicant, 500 LLC, applied for two land use applications: a floor area ratio and site plan review application to allow for the construction of a three-story addition; the applicant later withdrew the application for the floor area ratio variance. At the November 17, 2008 City

Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission denied the site plan review application. The applicant appealed this decision and the City Council granted the appeal on January 9, 2009 and approve the site plan review application with the following conditions:

- 1) CPED Planning staff review and approve the site plan, lighting plan, landscaping plan, and elevations before permits may be issued.
- 2) All site improvements shall be completed by January 9, 2010, (unless extended by the Zoning Administrator) or permits may be revoked for noncompliance.
- 3) The first floor original window openings have the filled-in block removed and replaced with display windows. The original window openings on the first floor shall not be enlarged or reduced from their original construction when the windows are installed.
- 4) The roof of the addition shall have a roof line with a cornice that is similar the existing roof line and cornice on the existing building as required by section 530.120(c).
- 5) The site plan includes a landscaped area at the rear of the building where a loading dock is proposed, but that will not be allowed by Public Works. The landscaping plan in this area shall provide a superior landscaping plan including an ornamental tree, a variety of plant types beyond the nine required that cover the entire landscaped area, and seasonal interest as an amenity in lieu of the two trees required by section 530.160.

Preservation: At the November 18, 2008 Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) meeting, the commission adopted a motion to nominate 500 3rd Street North for consideration for designation as a local historic landmark and directed staff to notice and present this item before the Commission at the next regular meeting, December 2, 2008. At the December 2, 2008 HPC meeting, the Commission adopted staff findings and approved the nomination, established interim protection, nominated the property, and directed the Planning Director to commence a designation study of 500 3rd Street North.

C. REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

D. PROPOSED WORK AND ANALYSIS

The applicant has submitted plans that propose to convert the existing warehouse building into offices with parking in the basement and first floor, and a roof-top addition (see Appendix A). The applicant is proposing a project with extensive work to the exterior and interior of the building. As part of this proposal, staff reviewed nine exterior alterations and two interior alterations.

Note: In the staff analysis of the proposed work when only a page number is provided the document referenced is the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (1995).

You can access a copy of this document with the following web link:

http://www.nps.gov/hps/tps/standards/standards_complete.pdf.

1. Masonry

Background: The original 1908 building was constructed of a brown/red colored brick.

Proposed Work: The applicant states that the exterior reddish-brown brick and corbelled cornice will be repaired and tuckpointed as needed, maintaining all exterior materials and mortar strength and color.

Analysis: The applicant's proposal to limit masonry work to those areas that are in need of work will meet the Secretary of Interior Rehabilitation Standards and their proposal will not negatively impact the property under interim protection nor the district if it meets the following conditions:

- Rehabilitation work is carried out without the use of sandblasting or the use of acid;
- New mortar shall match the old mortar in strength, composition, color, and texture as confirmed by testing.
- New mortar joints shall match old mortar joints in width and in joint profile;
- New brick used shall match original in appearance and qualities confirmed through testing.

2a. Windows 1st Floor:

Background: The ground floor windows and openings have been in-filled with a variety of materials including glass block, concrete masonry, painted plywood, solid steel doors, and aluminum-framed windows (see Appendix A8-A10). However, it appears that all original window openings have been retained on the west and south elevations (see Appendix A22 and B9-B10). Staff believes that the following bays contained openings that were originally entrance openings: South Elevation: Bay 2, 4, 6, and 8; East Elevation: Bay 2 and 3

Proposed Work: The applicant is proposing to remove the materials within the existing window openings on the 3rd Street and 5th Avenue elevations and to install a clear anodized window within the existing opening with the exception of Bay 1 on the 3rd Street Elevation (see Appendix A22 and A23). This window opening is proposed to become an entrance. The anodized windows are proposed to be a series of three windows with three transom windows above (see Appendix A24_W2). The interior portion of the window is proposed to have a graphic display of historic images of the building and neighborhood to provide visual interest at the pedestrian. This was a Zoning and Planning Committee condition of approval (see Appendix A5).

The window openings on the east elevation (alley) are proposed to be brick infilled with salvaged and matching brick.

Analysis: The window proposal for the first floor does not meet the second standard of the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, “The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided (page 62).” Furthermore, the proposed 1st floor window proposal would adversely impact a potential historic landmark and/or contributing structure to the Minneapolis Warehouse National Historic District.

Similar to commercial storefront of a historic building, the first floor of a warehouse is one of the most important architectural features of the building because it plays a crucial role in telling the story of the building’s use and movement. The combination of the windows and door openings along with the loading docks and canopies convey where people and products entered and exited the building and where the original building offices were (Source: NPS Brief #11). Although, the historic material of the subject property’s windows and doors has been removed, the building’s original window openings have likely not been altered which substantially helps in retaining the building’s integrity.

The applicant’s proposal for windows on the first floor is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards in at least two specific ways.

1. **Design:** The applicant has proposed to increase the size of the West Elevation: Bay 1 in order to accommodate a new entrance. The Secretary of Interior Guidelines for the Rehabilitation for entrances does not recommend the altering of original window opening. When the original window material is missing the guidelines recommend that “The replacement windows 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 (page 83). It is recommended that the applicant use physical documentation and pictorial evidence to guide restoration work (see Appendix B9 and B10).
2. **Materials:** The applicant has proposed to use a clear anodized aluminum material for the window frames of the first floor. The National Park Service does not recommend the use of anodized aluminum on storefronts. It states the following about anodized aluminum: “Avoid use of materials that were unavailable when the storefront was constructed; this includes vinyl and aluminum siding, anodized aluminum, mirrored or tinted glass, artificial stone, and brick veneer (source: Preservation Brief on the Rehabilitation of Storefronts #11).”

In addition to not being in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines, the design, in particular the proposed increasing in size of Bay 1 on the west elevation is not in compliance with the January 9, 2009 City Council conditions of approval #3 which states that, “The original window openings on the first floor shall not be enlarged or reduced from their original construction when the windows are installed.”

2b. Windows 2nd through 4th floors

Background: Most, if not all the windows on the second through fourth floors are original to the building (see Appendix B1, B2, B4, and B7). The fenestration pattern for the west and south elevation has two windows for the outer bays and one window for the interior bays. The fenestration of the east elevation is one window per bay (with the exception of Bay 4). There are no windows on the north elevation (see Appendix A11). The windows are of wood construction and appear to be double hung. The windows are two-over-two divided light windows. The windows along the alley (east elevation) contain a metal wire within the sash (A11.2). The windows appear to be in need of repair; however, the windows could likely be repaired and the applicant has not stated that the windows are beyond repair.

Proposed Work: For floors two through four, the applicant is proposing to replace the windows and increase the size of the window openings. The applicant proposes to increase the width but not the height of the existing windows to match the first floor masonry opening (see Appendix A5). The window material is proposed to be a clear anodized aluminum. The applicant states that due to the inability to have windows on the northern elevation due to a shared property line the increased window sizes on the other elevations are important (see Appendix A5).

Analysis: The window replacement proposal is not compliance with the second standard of the Secretary of Interior standards for rehabilitation, that is, “The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved and that removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided (page 62).” The replacement of windows or other character-defining features is the last preferred action in the hierarchy of actions for rehabilitation work set out by the Secretary of Interior (see Table 1):

Table 1: Hierarchy of rehabilitation work

1. identify, retain and preserve
2. protect and maintain
3. repair
4. replace (page 63)

As one of the few parts of a building serving as both an interior and exterior feature, windows are nearly always an important part of the historic character of a building. In most buildings, windows also comprise a considerable amount of the historic fabric of the wall plane and thus are deserving of special consideration in a rehabilitation project (page 7).

It is apparent that the windows on the second through fourth floors are in need of repair (see Appendix B7). However, the applicant has not provided information that the windows are beyond repair (see Appendix A). In addition, the windows in the case of the subject property are vitally important to retaining the interior and exterior integrity given it is one of the oldest examples of a particular type of construction.

The applicant’s proposal for windows on the second through fourth floors is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards in at least three specific ways.

1. **Treatment Type:** The applicant has not demonstrated that repair isn’t an option for the rehabilitation project. The proposed work does not meet the intent of the guideline that encourages the rehabilitation of the window frames and sash even if patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing is required (page 82).
2. **Design:** The applicant has proposed to increase the size of the window openings. The applicant has stated the need to increase the size of the windows is due to the new use and the inability to have windows along the north elevation. CPED recognizes the building code constraints in not allowing windows along the north elevation, however, staff believes based on a site visit that the existing window openings would provide adequate light for an office (see Appendix B8 for interior images). In addition, there are examples of historic warehouse/mill buildings being converted into office buildings that have similar size window openings, including the Crown Roller Mill Building (see Appendix B8).

If it is found that the window material is beyond repair it is recommended that the windows are replaced in kind (page 82).”

3. **Materials:** The applicant has proposed to use a clear anodized aluminum material for the window frames of the first floor. The National Park Service does not recommend the use of anodized aluminum on storefronts. It states the following about anodized aluminum: “Avoid use of materials

that were unavailable when the storefront was constructed; this includes vinyl and aluminum siding, anodized aluminum, mirrored or tinted glass, artificial stone, and brick veneer (source: Preservation Brief on the Rehabilitation of Storefronts #11).”

3. Fire Escape

Background: Currently, there is a fire escape on the east elevation. The applicant states that it is, “uncertain whether the fire escape was original or was added during the (currently undetermined) period of significance (see Appendix A4). In reviewing the 1912-1930 Sanborn Map and the building permits staff believes that the fire escape is likely original to the building (see Appendix B0.8 and B0.9).

Proposed Work: The applicant is proposing to remove the fire escape. The applicant states that the fire escape is in poor condition and poses a safety hazard. The applicant also states that the removal of the fire escape will improve building security by eliminating unsupervised exterior access to upper floor windows (see Appendix A4).

Analysis: The fire escape proposal is not compliance with the second standard of the Secretary of Interior standards for rehabilitation: The Secretary of the Interior considers metal fire escapes to be character-defining features of a building (see Appendix B10 and B11) and recommends that distinctive materials be retained (page 62). The fire escape on the subject property even though it is on a secondary elevation is clearly viewable along 5th Avenue North (see Appendix B6.1).

A possible alternative to removing the fire escape would be to rehabilitate the existing fire escape and convert it into a balcony as proposed by the National Park Service (see Appendix B15 and B16). If the existing landing and railing are too deteriorated to repair, they could be replaced in kind with new skeletal assemblies to match the historic feature (see Appendix B15).

4. Entrances

Background: From the pictorial information it appears that the south elevation originally contained four entrances: Bays 2, 4, 6, and 8 (see Appendix A22, B1, B2, and B5) and the east elevation originally contained 2 entrances (see Appendix B6.1). The original ground floor entrance openings on the south and east elevations have likely been retained, but they have now been in-filled with a variety of materials including glass block, concrete masonry, painted plywood, solid steel doors, and aluminum-framed windows (see Appendix A8-A10). The belief that the original openings exist is guided in particular by the horizontal stone element that runs the length of the south and west elevations which is positioned at the bottom of the first floor windows. It appears to have been unaltered. In addition, photos from 1991 show the same window and door openings as today (see Appendix B2, B4, B9, and B10).

Proposed Work: The applicant has proposed to install new entrance doors on the south elevation in Bay 6 and 8 that fit within the existing openings (see Appendix A23). The applicant also proposes to convert on the south elevation Bay 2 and 4 into windows (see Appendix A22 and A23). The material proposed for the doors is a clear anodized aluminum.

On the east elevation the applicant has proposed to brick infill the entrance openings and construct two new openings for parking entrance doors with a metal coiling door (see Appendix A23 and A33).

Analysis: The first floor entrance proposal does not meet the second standard of the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and would adversely impact the first floor of this important warehouse.

Similar to commercial storefront of a historic building, the first floor of a warehouse is one of the most important architectural features of the building because it plays a crucial role in telling the story of the building's use and movement. The combination of the entrance and window openings along with the loading docks and canopies convey where people and products entered and exited the building and where the original building offices were (Source: NPS Brief #11). Although, the historic material of the subject property's entrances and windows has been removed, the building's original entrance openings have likely not been altered which substantially helps in retaining the building's integrity.

The applicant's proposal for first floor entrances is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines in at least three specific ways.

1. **Design proposal for existing openings:** The elimination/alteration of four entrance opening on the first floor (South Elevation: Bay 2 and Bay 4 and East Elevation: Bay 2 and 3) is not in compliance with the second standard of the Secretary of Interior Standards which recommends that the retention of character distinctive materials and the avoidance of alteration to character distinctive features (see Appendix A22 and A23 and page 62). It is realized that the original entrances are missing, however, the pattern of entrance openings that exist are important features in illustrating the historic warehouse use of the building and can guide rehabilitation work. The recommended course of action set out by the Secretary of Interior guidelines for the rehabilitation of entrances when historic features are missing is to retain the original opening (see page 87)."
2. **Materials:** The proposed clear anodized aluminum is not in compliance with the National Park Service recommended treatments for storefronts. The National Park Service provides the following advice for window and entrance material selection, "Avoid use of materials that were unavailable when the storefront was constructed; this includes vinyl and aluminum siding, anodized aluminum, mirrored or tinted glass, artificial stone, and brick veneer (Source: Preservation Brief on the Rehabilitation of Storefronts #11)."
3. **Design proposal for new openings:** The proposal to install two new openings on the east elevation for parking entrance doors is not in compliance with the second standard of Secretary of Interior Standards because it would be an alteration that would substantially disturb the spatial relationship of the 1st floor. This proposal would also require the elimination of two likely original entrance openings and a historic loading dock. The Secretary of Interior Standards recommends the retention of character distinctive materials and the avoidance of alteration to character distinctive features (page 62). The National Park Service created an Interpreting the Standards Bulletin #17 on Adding Parking to the Interior of Historic Buildings which further explains how it is not recommend that new openings on significant facades, disturb the appearance of the existing fenestration. The applicant's proposal would create new openings on a significant façade and disturb the appearance of the east elevation (see Appendix A22 and A23).

5. *Building Addition*

Background: The building was built with a flat roof and detailed cornice. The existing building is approximately 53 feet in height and has 40,612 square feet of floor area (10,153 square feet per floor)

Proposed Work: The applicant is proposing to construct a two-story addition that will extend to three stories for approximately 10 percent of the floor area (see Appendix A23). The proposed addition would add 13,571 square feet of office area and 8,449 square feet of patio area. The addition would extend to a maximum height of 85 feet (60 percent increase in height at its highest point).

The addition's first floor is proposed to be setback on the south and west elevation approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of a bay (see Appendix A19). On the east and north elevation the addition's first floor is proposed to be flush with the existing building wall. The second floor of the addition would be stepped back approximately ten feet on the east, south, and a portion of the west elevation from the first floor of the addition. Along the north elevation and a portion of the east elevation the addition is proposed to be flush with the existing building wall. The main material of the proposed addition is a painted, corrugated metal siding (see Appendix A7 and A30-A32).

Analysis: The applicant provides their analysis of how the proposal meets the National Park Service guidelines (see Appendix A7)

CPED believes that the proposed addition is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation in particular the ninth standard. The ninth standard states that "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment (see page 62). In addition, staff believes that the addition would adversely impact this potential historic landmark.

The design proposal of the applicant's building addition although differentiates the old from the new is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards in at least four specific ways.

- 1. Scale and Size:** The proposed addition would add 33 percent more floor area to the building and increase the height by 60 percent. The size of the addition is not in scale with the relationship with the historic building and would substantially detract from the original construction. The Secretary of Interior recommends limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building (page 112 and 113). In addition, the Secretary of the Interior has created a bulletin that explains how they can meet the Standards and Guidelines. This bulletin states that, "Rooftop additions are almost never appropriate for buildings that are less than four stories high. Generally, rooftop additions should not be more than one story in height, and are more compatible on buildings that are adjacent to taller buildings or dense urban environments. Rooftop additions that do not meet these principles generally will not meet the standards (see Appendix B14.3 and B14.4).
- 2. Visibility/Location :** The proposed addition would be clearly viewable from 3rd Street North and 5th Avenue. The proposed location of the addition will be clearly visible along the character defining facades which is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior guideline for additions that recommend, "Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an inconspicuous side of a historic building (page 113)."
- 3. Required Demolition** The proposed addition would result in the demolition of the roof-top chimney and the elevator penthouse that provides access to the rooftop (see Appendix B6.1 and B0.6-B0.7). This is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Guidelines for Additions that recommend 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 (page 112).
- 4. Structural Feasibility and Requirements:** It is uncertain if the existing building can support this size addition. The applicant has not demonstrated that the existing building will be able to support the

proposed addition. CPED believes that the proposed addition, if it is structurally feasible to be built, may require substantial structural alterations to the interior portion of the building in order to support a two-story addition. The applicant has not provided documentation that the building's current design will be able to support the addition without negatively altering the interior.

6. Loading Docks

Background: The south elevation contains an approximately fourteen-foot wide loading dock that has a slight grade increase from the southeast to the northwest (see Appendix A13 and B5). The loading dock also contains stairs on the northern portion of the loading dock (see Appendix B1-B3). The building dock form and design is likely original to the building given how it relates to the building's first floor openings (see Appendix B1-B4).

The east elevation also contains a loading dock area that extends less than a foot from the building wall. There were railroad tracks that ran east-west in the alley between 3rd Street North and Washington Avenue North until at least 1951 (see Appendix B0.8). This was likely the primary original loading and unloading area for the building to the railcars.

Proposed Work: For the south elevation the applicant is proposing to remove the nine feet of the loading dock closest to the street and leave the five feet of the loading dock nearest the building. Where the applicant proposes to remove the portions of the loading dock the applicant is proposing to construct an at-grade sidewalk along 5th Avenue North (see Appendix A13). The applicant states that the new concrete construction for the sidewalk will match the existing loading dock in color, materials, and details.

For the east elevation the applicant proposes to completely remove the loading dock to allow for the proposed parking entrance doors (see Appendix A22).

Analysis: The applicant provides their analysis in how it complies with the National Park Service guidelines (see Appendix A4).

CPED believes that the proposed removal of the loading docks is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. Staff also believes that it would adversely impact this potential historic landmark and the warehouse district.

The Secretary of Interior has established a bulletin on new infill for historic loading door openings (see Appendix B13 and B14). Although this pertains to door openings it indirectly touches on loading docks (see below).

“During rehabilitation it is often necessary to make modifications to loading entrances and doors in order to accommodate new uses and tenants. When retaining the historic loading doors is not possible, or when the historic doors have been removed, special consideration should be given in the design of new replacements. Inappropriate alterations to these features may have a significant effect on the visual appearance of the building, one that may radically change the historic character of a property and cause a project to be denied certification. When evaluating proposed new treatments for historic loading entrances the question of whether or not the historic function of the opening can still be perceived should be asked. Does the new infill convey in its design the principal visual qualities of the historic door and openings, or does it read more as a window or storefront (see Appendix B13 and B14).

Loading docks are a vital element that depicts how the first floor of a warehouse was used. The combination of the loading docks, entrances, window openings and canopies convey where people and products entered and exited the building and where the original building offices were (Source: NPS Brief #11). In addition, the loading docks within the right-of-way are seen throughout the proposed national warehouse district and help unify the buildings within the district. Furthermore, the loading docks are a

vital element that distinguishes the Minneapolis North Loop Warehouse District from other warehouse districts in other cities and other portions of Minneapolis.

It is realized that loading docks built in the right-of-way add an element of complexity in creating a pedestrian-friendly streetscape; however, they do not necessarily detract from a pedestrian-friendly streetscape and steps can be taken to retain them while not interrupting a safe pedestrian path. In addition to not detracting from the pedestrian streetscape, the loading docks can create unique gathering places such as restaurant patios for those buildings being converted from their original use. CPED recognizes and appreciates the accessibility and safety concerns of loading docks.

Cities throughout the country that have historic districts and elements such as cobblestone streets and loading docks in the public right-of-way have been able to retain these important historic features. 13th Avenue Northwest within the Pearl District in Portland, Oregon is one example of a historic district having loading docks within the right-of-way. In 1996, the City of Portland adopted design guidelines for Northwest 13th Avenue that encourages retaining these loading docks (see Appendix B21 and B22). The guidelines state the following:

“Loading Docks, Overhead Doors, and Canopies - Many of the buildings along NW 13th Avenue have concrete or wood loading docks projecting into the street, with canopies above and roll-up doors adjacent to the loading space. These features are among the most distinctive features in the District, and should be retained even where loading operations have been discontinued. New docks are also encouraged, to a maximum projection of 11 feet (Source: NW 13th Avenue Historic District Guidelines).”

7. Canopies

Background: The south elevation contains an 85-foot wide metal canopy with a shed roof pitch that provides coverage over the 14-foot wide loading dock (see Appendix A22 and B1-B3). It is unlikely that this canopy is original to the building; however, it is likely that the building contained a similar sized canopy in width and depth. City records show that there were three canopies added to the warehouse in 1921 that measured 15 feet wide and 14 feet deep and that a fourth canopy was added in 1923 (see Appendix B15).

The east elevation contains an approximately 11-foot wide canopy over the entrance opening on Bay 2 (see Appendix B1).

Proposed Work: The applicant proposes to remove the south elevation canopy and construct a new canopy. The applicant states that, “The metal canopy is severely deteriorated and is structurally unsound.” The new design proposes to replace the canopy with a canopy that reduces the depth by five feet. The new construction proposes to use painted metal framing structural members and corrugated metal roofing to match the original. Diagonal steel suspension rods will be replaced in-kind (see Appendix A5). An additional difference between the existing and proposed canopy is the proposed new arched segment above the main entrance on Bay 6 (see Appendix A24).

For the east elevation the applicant is proposing to remove the existing canopy and construct a new metal canopy above the ramps to the parking floors using a similar design.

Analysis : The applicant provides their analysis in how it complies with the National Park Service guidelines (see Appendix A5).

CPED believes that the proposed replacement of the south and east canopies is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Staff also believes that it would adversely impact this potential historic landmark and the warehouse district. Metal canopies of this nature are a unifying characteristic of the district. The buildings throughout the Warehouse District, in particular the western portion of the district, contain similar canopies. The canopies are an important indicator of where the primary entrances that provided the movement of products from the building to the mode of transportation took place: be it horse, buggy, train, automobile, or truck. In addition, the relationship between the canopy, loading dock, windows and building's entrances that are important elements of retaining the integrity of a warehouse.

It is apparent from the images that the existing canopy is in need of repair and may need to be replaced (see Appendix B1-B3, and B5). However, the applicant's proposal is not a replacement in kind and it would substantially alter the character of the building.

8.. Roof-top Features: Elevator Penthouse and Chimney

Background: 500 3rd Street North contains a chimney and an elevator penthouse on the rooftop. These items are likely original to the building (see Appendix B0.8-B1).

Proposed Work: The applicant proposes to remove these items for the proposed building addition.

Analysis: The proposed demolition of the rooftop elevator penthouse and chimney is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards in particular the second standard, that states, "The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved and that removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided (page 62)."

The chimney which is clearly visible from 5th Avenue North is a character-defining feature of the building that was built at the time of original construction. The removal of the chimney would detract from the building by eliminating an important design element.

The removal of the elevator penthouse for the proposed addition is also not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards due to the proposed addition not meeting the Secretary of Interior Standards nor Guidelines for additions.

9. Site Plan

Background: The subject property's building footprint appears to cover all but the 10 feet along the east elevation (see Appendix B0.5).

Proposed Work: The applicant proposes to install a landscaping area approximately 13 feet wide by 16 feet deep along the southern portion of the eastern elevation (see Appendix A13). The applicant also proposes to construct a trash enclosure along the northern portion of the eastern elevation (see Appendix A13).

Analysis: For the proposed landscaping and trash enclosure the applicant has not provided additional information beyond the location of the landscaped area and trash enclosure. The location of these items in

their proposed location would likely not detract from the building. Staff recommends that elevations and landscaping plan of the proposed items be submitted that show how the items meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and the Secretary of Interior Guidelines for Rehabilitation.

10. Interior Construction (Basement and 1st Floor)

Background: The interior of 500 3rd Street contains one of C.A.P. Turner's earliest extant examples of a building in Minneapolis and in the country of a flat slab reinforced concrete design with mushroom capital columns. Each floor contains 21 columns (see Appendix A15).

Proposed Work: The applicant proposes to have parking on the basement and first floors. This would require the removal an 18 foot by 18 foot area of the floor (see Appendix A17). The applicant is proposing to have 10 parking spaces on the basement level and 11 parking spaces on the first floor (see Appendix A16 and A17).

Analysis: The applicant's proposal to add parking to the basement and first floors is not in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards (see Appendix B14.1). Staff also believes that it would adversely impact this potential historic landmark and contributing structure of the warehouse district by adding two new openings on a character-defining façade

11. Interior Construction (Second through Fourth Floors)

Background: The interior of 500 3rd Street contains one of C.A.P. Turner's earliest extant examples of a building in Minneapolis and in the country of a flat slab reinforced concrete design with mushroom capital columns. Each floor contains 21 columns (see Appendix A15).

Proposed Work: The applicant states that the proposed project requires minimal penetration of the existing floor slabs to make way for new stair, elevator, and mechanical shaft openings, but these will not impact the overall structural system's integrity, strength, or visual appearance (see Appendix A6 and A15-19)."

Analysis: The applicant's proposal to retain the mushroom capital columns and to make few alterations to the reinforced concrete floors on floors two through four will meet the intent for the Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines if it is shown that the building's current design is able to be completed without jeopardizing the building's structural integrity (see page 62).

Even though there are few alterations proposed to the columns on the second through fourth floors at this time, CPED has concerns that the proposed addition may require substantial structural alterations to the interior portion of the building in order to support a two-story addition. The applicant has not provided documentation that the building's current design will be able to support the addition without negatively altering the interior.

E. FINDINGS

Background

1. The Green & DeLaitre Company Wholesale Grocery Warehouse Building at 500 North 3rd Street is a four-story rectangular brick building that was built in 1908 and designed by architect and engineer Claude Allen Porter (C.A.P.) Turner.

2. The character-defining facades of the building are the east, south, and west exterior elevations. The character-defining features of this building on these elevations include the masonry, entrances, windows, loading docks, fire escape, canopies, rooftop features: chimney/elevator penthouse, building Site (and Interior).
3. Similar to commercial storefront of a historic building, the first floor of a warehouse is one of the most important architectural features of the building because it plays a crucial role in telling the story of the building's use and movement. The combination of the windows and door openings along with the loading docks and canopies help demonstrate this relationship.
4. The subject property is under interim protection. Interior and exterior alterations must meet the requirements of Chapter 599.

Building Significance

5. The subject property was nominated for consideration as a local landmark by the Heritage Preservation Commission on December 2, 2008.
6. The subject property is a contributing structure to the National Register Warehouse Historic District which is under interim protection. The District's period of significance is circa 1865-1930.
7. In addition, to being a contributing structure to the National Register Warehouse Historic District, the Green and DeLaitre Company Wholesale Grocery Warehouse Building is significant for it is likely the earliest extant example in Minneapolis of a building built and designed by C.A.P. Turner with the flat slab reinforced concrete design. Minneapolis likely had the first building with the concrete reinforced concrete design, that being, the Johnson-Bovely Company Building located at 426 2nd Avenue South; however, this building was torn down in 1975. In 2002, Turner's Marshall Building (1907) in Milwaukee, WI was dedicated as a national historic civil engineering landmark for being the world's oldest extant example of a flat-slab concrete building (see Appendix B18).

Proposed Work: Windows (1st Floor)

8. The window proposal for the first floor does not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. In addition, this proposal is also not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Guidelines for windows due to the proposed design (increase in window opening size and replacement of window opening with entrance opening) and materials (anodized aluminum). Furthermore, the proposed 1st floor window proposal would adversely impact a potential historic landmark and/or contributing structure to the Minneapolis Warehouse National Historic District.
9. Although, the historic material of the subject property's first floor entrances and windows have been removed, the building's original entrance openings have likely not been altered which substantially helps in retaining the building's integrity.
10. The window proposal for the first floor does not meet the January 9, 2009 City Council condition of approval #3 which states that, "The original window openings on the first floor shall not be enlarged or reduced from their original construction when the windows are installed."

Proposed Work: Windows (2nd-4th Floors)

11. The window replacement proposal for the second through fourth floors is not compliance with the Secretary of Interior standards and does not meet the Secretary of Interior Guidelines for windows in regards to the proposed treatment type (replacement), design (increased window size), and materials (clear anodized aluminum). In addition, the window proposal for the 2nd through fourth floors would adversely impact this potential historic landmark and contributing structure to the warehouse district.
12. Most, if not all the windows on the second through fourth floors are original to the building. The windows appear to be in need of repair; however, the windows could likely be repaired and the applicant has not established evidence that the windows are beyond repair.
13. The replacement of windows or other character-defining features is the last preferred action in the hierarchy of actions for rehabilitation work set out by the Secretary of Interior.

14. The original windows of the subject property are vitally important to retaining the interior and exterior integrity given it is one of the oldest examples of a particular type of construction.

Proposed Work: Fire Escape

15. The fire escape is a character-defining feature of the building. The proposal to remove the fire escape is not compliance with the Secretary of Interior standards for rehabilitation.

16. A possible alternative to removing the fire escape would be to rehabilitate the existing fire escape and convert it into a balcony as proposed by the National Park Service.

Proposed Work: Entrances

17. The entrance proposal does not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and does not meet the Secretary of Interior Guidelines for entrances in at least three areas: design of existing openings(elimination of original openings), materials (clear anodized aluminum), and proposed design for new openings (installation of two new large openings on a character defining feature). In addition, staff believes that the proposed work would adversely impact this potential historic landmark and/or contributing structure to the warehouse district.

Proposed Work: Addition

18. The proposed addition is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. The proposed addition is also not in compliance with the guidelines fore additions in at least four areas: scale and size, visibility/location, required demolition, and structural feasibility/requirements. In addition, staff believes that the proposed work would adversely impact this potential historic landmark and contributing structure to the warehouse district.

Proposed Work: Loading Docks

19. The proposed removal of the loading docks is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. In addition, staff believes that the proposed work would adversely impact this potential historic landmark and/or contributing structure to the warehouse district.

20. Loading docks throughout the warehouse district help unify the buildings within the district.

Proposed Work: Canopies

21. The proposed replacement of the south and east canopies is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards. In addition, staff believes that the proposed work would adversely impact this potential historic landmark and/or contributing structure to the warehouse district.

22. It is apparent from the images that the existing canopy is in need of repair and may need to be replaced. However, the applicant's proposal is not a replacement in kind and it would substantially alter the character of the building.

Proposed Work: Roof-Top Features

23. The proposed demolition of the rooftop elevator penthouse and chimney is not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards. The chimney which is clearly visible from 5th Avenue North is a character-defining feature of the building that was built at the time of original construction. The removal of the chimney would detract from the building by eliminating an important design element. The removal of the elevator penthouse for the proposed addition is also not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards due to the proposed addition not meeting the Secretary of Interior Standards nor Guidelines for additions. Furthermore, the proposed work would adversely impact this potential historic landmark and/or contributing structure to the warehouse district.

Proposed Work: Site Plan

24. For the proposed landscaping and trash enclosure the applicant has not provided additional information beyond the location of the landscaped area and trash enclosure. The location of these items in their proposed location would likely not detract from the building. Staff recommends that elevations and landscaping plan of the proposed items be submitted that show how the items meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and the Secretary of Interior Guidelines for Rehabilitation.

Proposed Work: Interior

25. The applicant's proposal to add parking to the basement and first floors is not in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards. The proposal would require two new large openings on a character defining façade.
26. The applicant's proposal to retain the mushroom capital columns and to make few alterations to the reinforced concrete floors on floors two through four will meet the intent for the Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines if it is shown that the building current design is able to be completed without jeopardizing the building's structural integrity. CPED, however, has concerns that the proposed addition may require substantial structural alterations to the interior portion of the building in order to support a two-story addition. The applicant has not provided documentation that the building's current design will be able to support the addition without negatively altering the interior.

F. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the HPC adopt staff findings and **deny** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the 500 3rd Street rehabilitation and new addition project.

G. APPENDIX

Appendix A: Application

Appendix B: CPED Information