

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

**Certificate of Appropriateness**  
BZH-26404

**Date:** July 13, 2010

**Proposal:** Demolition of Historic Resource Application

**Applicant:** Alex Hall, United Properties LLC

**Address of Property:** 1611 East 46<sup>th</sup> Street

**Project Name:** Applewood Pointe Senior Housing Cooperative Project

**Contact Person and Phone:** Alex Hall, (952) 835-5300

**Planning Staff and Phone:** Aaron Hanauer, (612) 673-2494

**Date Application Deemed Complete:** June 21, 2010

**Publication Date:** July 6, 2010

**Public Hearing:** July 13, 2010

**Appeal Period Expiration:** July 23, 2010

**Ward:** 11

**Neighborhood Organization:** Northrop

**Attachments:**

Attachment A: Materials submitted by CPED staff – (A1-A11)

- A1: Context Map
- A2: Future Land Use Map
- A3: Extant Minneapolis Public Schools (1883-1962)
- A4-A5: Minneapolis Public Schools: Property Inventory List (2005)
- A6-A7: Northrop School Aerials
- A8.1-8.3: Cooper, Audobon, and Field Elementary School Images
- A9-A10: Minneapolis Public Schools Historic Context Study
- A11: Year Built Map

Attachment B: Materials submitted by Applicant (B1-B77)

- B1-B3: Cover Letter
- B4-B5: Certificate of Appropriateness Application
- B6: Property Owner Letter

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

- B7-B30: Historic Review of Northrop School
- B31-B44: Economic Feasibility Analysis of Rehabilitation
- B45: Possible Site Plan Keeping Northrop School
- B46-B47: Existing Northrop School Site Plan and Floor Plans
- B48: Old Survey
- B49-B52: Original Construction Plans
- B53: Proposed Rendering of New Construction
- B54: Proposed Site
- B55-B57: Proposed Floor Plans
- B57.5-B77: Existing Images and Photo Key

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division



**16<sup>th</sup> Avenue South:** Northrop School, circa 1930, Source: Minneapolis Public Schools

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division



**16<sup>th</sup> Avenue South:** Northrop School, 2010, Source: Landscape Research, LLC

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

<b>PROPERTY INFORMATION</b>	
Current name	Northrop School
Historic Name	Northrop School
Current Address	1611 East 46 <sup>th</sup> Street
Historic Address	1611 East 46 <sup>th</sup> Street
Original Construction Date	1923
Original Contractor	Bracker Construction Company
Original Architect	Bureau of Buildings
Historic Use	Education
Current Use	Vacant
Proposed Use	Demolition (New construction proposed to be senior housing).

## **A. BACKGROUND & DESCRIPTION**

The Cyrus Northrop School is located in the Northrop Neighborhood. The parcel covers a city block bound by East 46th Street on the North, East 47th Street on the South, 17th Avenue South on the East, and 16th Avenue on the West (Attachment A1). The school building was built in two phases. The southern, two-story brick portion was designed by the Bureau of Buildings, a division of the Minneapolis Public School System, and completed in 1923 (Attachment A6). In 1950, a two-story brick addition, designed by Minneapolis architectural firm, Land Raugland, was completed to compliment the 1923 portion. The 1950 addition includes a one-story gymnasium to the east (Attachment A6, B17, and B22).

The Neo-Classical style building is T-shaped in plan and contains 33,698 square feet. The school is constructed of reinforced concrete construction, clad with brown brick, and contains a brick smokestack. The building has a flat roof with a stone stringcourse at the parapet. The entrance at the 1923 portion of the school has a diamond-shaped stone inset above the doors and a stone plaque at the parapet (Attachment B14)

## **B. PROPOSED CHANGES**

The Applicant, United Properties, is proposing to demolish the Cyrus Northrop school building and build a two-building senior co-op that contains 98 units (Attachment B3, and B53-B56). The proposed north building, which is the location of the Northrop School building is proposed to have 42 units. The southern building is proposed to have 56 units (Attachment B3, B53, B54).

## **C. HERITAGE PRESERVATION 599.480 REVIEW**

Provision 599.480 describes the Heritage Preservation Commission review of a Demolition of Historic Resource Application.

*599.480 (a) In general. If the commission determines that the property is not an historic resource, the commission shall approve the demolition permit. If the commission determines that the property is an historic resource, the commission shall deny the demolition permit and direct the planning director to commence a designation study of the property, as provided in section 599.230, or shall approve the demolition permit as provided in this section.*

*(b) before approving the demolition of a property determined to be an historic resource, the Commission shall make findings that the demolition is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property, or that 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 Commission may delay a final decision for a reasonable period of time to allow parties interested in preserving the historic resource a reasonable opportunity to act to protect it.*

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

(c) *Mitigation plan. The commission may require a mitigation plan as a condition of any approval for demolition of an historic resource. 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.*

(d) *Demolition delay. The commission may stay the release of the building, wrecking or demolition permit for up to one hundred eighty (180) days as a condition of approval for a demolition of an historic resource if the resource has been found to contribute to a potential historic district to allow parties interested in preserving the historic resource a reasonable opportunity to act to protect it. The release of the permit may be allowed for emergency exception as required in section 599.50(b). (2001-Or-029, § 1, 3-2-01; 2009-Or-023, § 14, 3-27-2009)*

C1. UNSAFE OR DANGEROUS CONDITION:

The Applicant has not stated that the demolition is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition (see Attachment B2, B31-B33). However, the Applicant has stated that the building is in poor condition and is in need of substantial repair (Attachment B2-B3).

C2. REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES TO DEMOLITION:

The Applicant has analyzed a reuse of the Northrop school building as part of the senior co-op project, and has found that the reuse of the building is not financially feasible (Attachment B31-B34). United Properties states that the building is in poor condition and is in need of substantial repair (Attachment B2-B3). The Applicant has estimated that the remodeling and rehabilitation of the Northrop school would cost \$4.7 million or an estimated \$149 a square foot (Attachment B32-B33). In comparison, the cost of new construction for a 98-unit co-op would be \$77.00 per square foot. Therefore, the rehabilitation would add a \$2.3 million dollar premium (see Attachment B33). In addition, United Properties states that if Northrop is reused they would only be able to provide 15 residential units in the existing building and have a total of 71 residential units for the entire project, compared to the proposal with all new construction that would provide 98 residential units (Attachment B32 and B45).

C3. SIGNIFICANCE:

**2005 Context Study:** In 2005, the City of Minneapolis commissioned Landscape Research LLC to complete the Minneapolis Public Schools Historic Context Study. The context study analyzed the 140 buildings constructed, acquired, maintained, expanded and sometimes removed by the Minneapolis Board of Education between 1849 and 1962. Today, 50 public schools built between 1849 and 1962 remain; 30 of these schools are elementary schools.

The study states that “The Minneapolis public schools constructed between 1849 and 1962 reflect the growth and development of the City’s public education system, and are evidence of some of the best of national planning and design principles involving the efforts of local

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

architects and the Board of Education's Bureau of Education's Bureau of Buildings (Attachment A10)." Although the context study did not evaluate public schools for designation, the study suggest that, "the schools' planning and design characteristics, and each property's relationship to the creation of the Minneapolis public school plant should be among chief evaluation considerations (Attachment A10)."

The Historic Context study states that "Designation Criterion #1 (association with significant events or periods that exemplify broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history) and Criterion #4 (distinctive characteristics of an architectural or engineering type or style, or method of construction) provide a framework for future evaluation (Attachment A10)." A recommended period of significance for the schools is 1883 to 1962.

The Context Study also states that among the schools of particular significance are the composite plan elementary and junior high schools developed by the Bureau of Buildings throughout the 1920s and early 1930s which includes the Northrop school building (Attachment A10). Most of the Minneapolis elementary and junior high schools built during the 1920s and 1930s were based on either the Composite Plan of 1919 or 1925. The historic context study states that, "These schools included a variety of classroom units that could be variously combined a single, complete plan." This [composite] plan was considered able to allow seamless additions, producing what the bureau called an efficient and attractive building." The context study states that these buildings are particularly significant for their "planning, design characteristics and relationship to the creation of the Minneapolis public school plant (Attachment A10)."

The report, however, notes that "some of these schools have had extensive additions to primary elevations, and that an evaluation of the alterations should be a part of future evaluation and designation efforts (Attachment A10)."

**2010 Consultant Recommendation:** For the Demolition of Historic Resource Application, Landscape Research, the firm that completed the 2005 context study, was hired by United Properties to complete a historic analysis of Cyrus Northrop School. Landscape Research concludes that Northrop School (1923) is not eligible for heritage designation under Criteria 1 and 4 (Attachment B26). The Consultant states that "Although Cyrus Northrop School is associated with the development of the Minneapolis public school system, it does not posses more significance than the thirty remaining schools built for elementary use in the Minneapolis system between 1849 and 1962 (Attachment B26)." Landscape Research mentions that, "The school ceased operating as part of the Minneapolis elementary school system in 1978 (Attachment B26)."

The Consultant also states that three other elementary schools, in addition to Northrop school, were built that follow the Bureau of Buildings Composite Plan of 1919: Field (1920), Cooper (1923), and Audobon (1924). Landscape Research states that Field and Cooper are exemplary examples of this plan. Audobon Elementary School, which is now known as Lake Harriet Community Lower, is also extant.

**CPED:** CPED completed a separate historic review analysis of Northrop School using the seven designation criteria as a guide. Based on the following review, CPED believes that Northrop School has the potential to meet designation Criterion 1 and Criterion 4, however,

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

three other schools built following the 1919 Composite Plan still exist and are stronger candidates for local designation.

*1. The property is associated with significant events or with periods that exemplify broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history.*

The Minneapolis school system is an important part of the cultural and social history of the City of Minneapolis. The Northrop School, built in 1923 is part of this history, and is an example of the Bureau of Buildings Composite Plan of 1919. However, Northrop School specifically was not found to be associated with significant events that warrant designation. In addition, of the four elementary schools that were built following the 1919 Composite Plan, Northrop School is likely the least significant in capturing the broad patterns of cultural political, economic, or social history. The Northrop School had the shortest operating time as a public school compared to the other 1919 Composite Plan schools. Northrop Elementary School was open from 1923 until 1978, and then from circa 1994-2005. In comparison, Field and Aubdobon are still open today, and Cooper Elementary School was recently closed.

Currently, the City of Minneapolis has two locally designated landmarks that were built as part of the Minneapolis public school system: Madison School (1887) at 501 East 15<sup>th</sup> Street, and Fredricka Bremer Intermediate School (1888), at 1214 Lowry Avenue North.

*2. The property is associated with the lives of significant persons or groups.*

In a cursory review of students and faculty, Northrop school in of itself is not known to be associated with significant persons or groups that best captures that individual or group's importance.

Cyrus Northrop School was named after Cyrus Northrop, who served as the second president of the University of Minnesota from 1884-1911. No direct association of Cyrus Northrop and the Northrop Neighborhood or Northrop School could be found.

*3. The property contains or is associated with distinctive elements of city or neighborhood identity.*

Similar to other neighborhoods in Minneapolis, the Northrop neighborhood received its name from the school. Although Cyrus Northrop School does help provide identity to the Northrop neighborhood, the school/neighborhood association does not stand out compared to other school/neighborhood associations in Minneapolis.

*4. The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural or engineering type or style, or method of construction.*

Cyrus Northrop School was designed in a Neo-Classical style and based on the Minneapolis School's 1919 Composite Plan. The schools built following the 1919 composite plan are known for being quality schools that were built to last and are

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

considered significant for their “planning, design characteristics and relationship to the creation of the Minneapolis public school plan.” Even though Northrop School is an example of the 1919 Composite Plan, three other 1919 Composite Plan schools still exist, and two are considered to be exemplary (Cooper and Field).

*5. The property exemplifies a landscape design or development pattern distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness or quality of design or detail.*

The Cyrus Northrop School does not exemplify a landscape design distinguished by innovation, rarity, or uniqueness (Attachment A6-A7, and B58-B77). The lot is a typical elementary school lot, which contains a pervious and impervious playground area, and parking lot.

In addition, the school does not exemplify a development pattern distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness or quality of design or detail. Schools built in the 1920s and 1930's were guided by the 1923 Board of Education mandate that schools be located according to projected population trends. The Board required that every child must be within a three-quarter mile walk to an elementary school (Attachment B17). The location of a permanent Northrop School building at 1611 East 46<sup>th</sup> Street in 1923 assisted in the school board meeting this mandate.

*6. The property exemplifies works of master builders, engineers, designers, artists, craftsmen or architects.*

Edward H. Enger was the head of the Bureau of Buildings from 1919 to 1951. The Bureau of Building schools built during Mr. Enger's leadership, in particular the composite plan schools built in the 1920s and 1930s, are recognized as well planned and well designed schools. Currently, no school designed by the Bureau of Buildings and Edward H. Enger are designated. However, Cyrus Northrop School is one of eight extant schools designed by the Bureau of Buildings and Mr. Enger that employed either the Composite Plan of 1919 or 1925. More specifically it is one of four extant schools that used the Composite Plan of 1919. If the demolition of Northrop School is allowed, Field, Cooper, and Audobon can also serve as quality examples of the 1919 Composite Plan.

*7. The property has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. (2001-Or-029, § 1, 3-2-01; 2009-Or-023, § 9, 3-27-2009)*

No known prehistory or history is believed to be on the site of the Cyrus Northrop elementary school.

C4: Integrity:

The National Register traditionally recognizes a property's integrity through seven aspects or qualities: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The Northrop school building does retain its integrity, as outlined below:

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

*Location:* Northrop School retains the location aspect of integrity. The current location is the location where the school building was originally built.

*Design:* Northrop School retains the design aspects of integrity. Design is the composition of elements that constitute the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property. Even with the 1950 addition on the north end of the building, the original design is intact. In addition, the Department of the Interior considers changes made to continue the function of the aid during its career as potentially acquiring significance in their own right, and do not necessarily constitute a loss of integrity of design. The 1950 addition was built to continue the function of the Cyrus Northrop School.

*Setting:* Northrop School retains its integrity of setting. The Cyrus Northrop school is surrounded by low-density residential buildings of the late 1920s and 1930s (Attachment A11). A majority of the low-density residential buildings from this era still remain.

*Materials:* Northrop School retains its integrity of materials. Even though the school's front doors have been replaced, the school building still contains the original brown brick, and architectural details including most of the original windows, the stone stringcourse at the parapet, a stone plaque at the parapet, the diamond-shaped stone inset above the doors (Attachment A13).

*Workmanship:* Northrop School retains its integrity of workmanship. Although, the school was not built with as many flourishes as the other schools in the 1920s, Northrop's physical evidence of the 1919 Composite Plan is evident.

*Feeling:* Northrop School retains its integrity of feeling. The 1923 building is still able to evoke the aesthetic or historic sense of an early 20<sup>th</sup> century Minneapolis school building.

*Association:* Northrop school retains its integrity of association. Minneapolis elementary schools built in the 1920s and 1930s were guided by the 1923 Board of Education mandate that schools be located according to projected population trends. The Board required that every child must be within a three-quarter mile walk to an elementary school. The Northrop School association with this plan can be seen with the surrounding residential neighborhood of 1920 and 1930 residential stock (Attachment A11).

## C5. ECONOMIC VALUE OR USEFULNESS OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURE

Northrop School has been vacant since 2005. From circa 1994 - 2005, Northrop Environmental Magnet School was at this location.

The Applicant provided proposed floor plans retaining the existing school building (Attachment B47). However, the Applicant states that the cost of renovation is \$4.7 million dollars or approximately \$314,000 for each of the proposed 15 residential units (Attachment

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

B36). In comparing, United Properties states that the cost of rehabilitation verses new construction would add an estimated \$2.3 million to the project costs (Attachment B31).

CPED appreciates that the Applicant analyzed a renovation of the Northrop School building. Even though the Applicant has found that rehabilitation of the entire Northrop school building or the 1923 portion is not feasible, CPED believes that design alternatives exist that would allow for a senior cooperative or other type of development on this site that retains the 1923 school building and possibly portions of the 1950 school building.

#### **D. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

CPED mailed public notices on June 25, 2010. As of July 6, 2010 no public comments were received.

#### **E. APPLICABLE ORDINANCES**

*Chapter 599. Heritage Preservation Regulation*

#### **ARTICLE V. DESIGNATION**

599.210. Designation criteria. The following criteria shall be considered in determining whether a property is worthy of designation as a landmark or historic district because of its historical, cultural, architectural, archaeological or engineering significance:

- (1) The property is associated with significant events or with periods that exemplify broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history.
- (2) The property is associated with the lives of significant persons or groups.
- (3) The property contains or is associated with distinctive elements of city or neighborhood identity.
- (4) The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural or engineering type or style, or method of construction.
- (5) The property exemplifies a landscape design or development pattern distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness or quality of design or detail.
- (6) The property exemplifies works of master builders, engineers, designers, artists, craftsmen or architects.
- (7) The property has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. (2001-Or-029, § 1, 3-2-01; 2009-Or-023, § 9, 3-27-2009)

**599.230. Commission decision on nomination.** The commission shall review all complete nomination applications. If the commission determines that a nominated property appears to meet at least one of the criteria for designation contained in section 599.210, the commission may direct the planning director to commence a designation study of the property. (2001-Or-029, § 1, 3-2-01)

**599.240. Interim protection.** (a) Purpose. Interim protection is established to protect a nominated property from destruction or inappropriate alteration during the designation process.

(b) *Effective date.* Interim protection shall be in effect from the date of the commission's decision to commence a designation study of a nominated property until the city

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

council makes a decision regarding the designation of the property, or for twelve (12) months, whichever comes first. Interim protection may be extended for such additional periods as the commission may deem appropriate and necessary to protect the designation process, not exceeding a total additional period of eighteen (18) months. The commission shall hold a public hearing on a proposed extension of interim protection as provided in section 599.170.

(c) *Scope of restrictions.* During the interim protection period, no alteration or minor alteration of a nominated property shall be allowed except where authorized by a certificate of appropriateness or a certificate of no change, as provided in this chapter. (2001-Or-029, § 1, 3-2-01)

**ARTICLE VIII. HISTORIC RESOURCES**

**599.440. Purpose.** This article is established to protect historic resources from destruction by providing the planning director with authority to identify historic resources and to review and approve or deny all proposed demolitions of property. (2001-Or-029, § 1, 3-2-01)

**599.450. Identification of historic resources.** The planning director shall identify properties that are believed to meet at least one of the criteria for designation contained in section 599.210, but that have not been designated. In determining whether a property is an historic resource, the planning director may refer to building permits and other property information regularly maintained by the director of inspections, property inventories prepared by or directed to be prepared by the planning director, observations of the property by the planning director or any other source of information reasonably believed to be relevant to such determination. (2001-Or-029, § 1, 3-2-01)

**599.460. Review of demolitions.** The planning director shall review all building permit applications that meet the definition for demolition to determine whether the affected property is an historic resource. If the planning director determines that the property is not an historic resource, the building permit shall be approved. If the planning director determines that the property is an historic resource, the building permit shall not be issued without review and approval by the commission following a public hearing as provided in section 599.170. (2001-Or-029, § 1, 3-2-01; 2009-Or-023, § 13, 3-27-2009)

**599.470. Application for demolition of historic resource.** An application for demolition of an historic resource shall be filed on a form approved by the planning director and shall be accompanied by all required supporting information, as specified in section 599.160. (2001-Or-029, § 1, 3-2-01)

**599.480. Commission decision.** (a) In general. If the commission determines that the property is not an historic resource, the commission shall approve the demolition permit. If the commission determines that the property is an historic resource, the commission shall deny the demolition permit and direct the planning director to prepare or cause to be prepared a designation study of the property, as provided in section 599.230, or shall approve the demolition permit as provided in this section.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

- (b) Destruction of historic resource. Before approving the demolition of a property determined to be an historic resource, the commission shall make findings that the demolition is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property, or that 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 commission may delay a final decision for up to one hundred eighty (180) days to allow parties interested in preserving the historic resource a reasonable opportunity to act to protect it.
- (c) Mitigation plan. The commission may require a mitigation plan as a condition of any approval for demolition of an historic resource. 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.
- (d) Demolition delay. The commission may stay the release of the building, wrecking or demolition permit for up to one hundred eighty (180) days as a condition of approval for a demolition of an historic resource if the resource has been found to contribute to a potential historic district to allow parties interested in preserving the historic resource a reasonable opportunity to act to protect it. The release of the permit may be allowed for emergency exception as required in section 599.50(b). (2001-Or-029, § 1, 3-2-01; 2009-Or-023, § 14, 3-27-2009)

## **F. FINDINGS**

1. The Cyrus Northrop Elementary School building was built in two phases. The original building was built in 1923; an addition was added in 1950.
2. The Cyrus Northrop Elementary School was built in a Neo-Classical architectural style.
3. The Cyrus Northrop Elementary School building was named in honor of Cyrus Northrop, who served as the second president of the University of Minnesota from 1884-1911.
4. The Applicant, United Properties, is proposing to demolish the Cyrus Northrop school building and build a two-building senior co-op that contains 98 units.
5. The 2005 Minneapolis Public Schools Historic Context Study states that, "The Minneapolis public schools constructed between 1849 and 1962 reflect the growth and development of the City's public education system, and are evidence of some of the best of national planning and design principles involving the efforts of local architects and the Board of Education's Bureau of Education's Bureau of Buildings."
6. The 2005 Context Study states that, "Among the schools of particular significance are the composite plan schools developed by the Bureau of Buildings throughout the 1920s and early 1930s (1919 Composite Plan or 1925 Composite Plan)."
7. The Northrop Elementary School Building is an example of the 1919 Minneapolis School Composite Plan.
8. Of the four extant elementary schools that were based on the 1919 Composite Plan, Northrop least captures the broad pattern of cultural, political, economic and social

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

history for two reasons. First, Northrop school was not found to be associated with significant events that warrant designation. Second, Northrop School was opened the least amount of time compared to Field, Cooper, and Audobon Elementary Schools.

9. Landscape Research completed a specific analysis of Cyrus Northrop School for United Properties. The Consultant concludes that Northrop School (1923) is not eligible for heritage designation under Criteria 1 and 4.
10. Landscape Research LLC states that there are three other elementary schools that were built that follow the Bureau of Buildings Composite Plan of 1919: Field (1920), Cooper (1923), and Audubon (1924). The Consultant concludes that Field and Cooper schools are exemplary examples of the 1919 Composite Plan (Attachment B26).
11. CPED completed an additional historic review analysis for Northrop Elementary School using the seven local designation criteria as a guide. Based on the review, CPED believes that Northrop School has the potential of meeting local designation Criterion #1 and Criterion #4, however, three other schools built following the 1919 Composite Plan still exist and are stronger candidates for local designation.
12. The Cyrus Northrop school building retains its architectural and historical integrity.
13. The Applicant has estimated that the rehabilitation of Northrop Elementary School would add a \$2.3 million dollar premium to the cost of their project.
14. The Applicant has analyzed a reuse of the Northrop school building as part of the senior co-op project and has found that the reuse of the building is not financially feasible as part of their senior co-op plan.
15. The Applicant has not stated that the demolition is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition.
16. CPED believes that design alternatives exist that would allow for a senior cooperative or other development of the site to retain the entire school building or the 1923 portion.

## G. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission adopt staff findings and **approve** the demolition application for the Cyrus Northrop Elementary School building at 1611 East 46<sup>th</sup> Street with the following conditions:

1. As mitigation for the demolition of the Cyrus Northrop Elementary School building, a photographic recordation of the property shall be prepared and submitted to staff that is in accordance with the guidelines of the Minnesota Historic Property Record. The recordation shall include all interior and exterior spaces and site design;
2. No wrecking permit shall be approved until land use approvals and heritage preservation conditions are obtained and final plans submitted;
3. The Demolition of Historic Resource approval shall expire if it is not acted upon within one year of approval, unless extended by the Planning Director in writing prior to one-year anniversary date of approvals.