

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

**Certificate of Appropriateness**  
BZH-26572

**Date:** October 12, 2010

**Proposal:** Request for COA to complete remodeling, a third-story addition, and window replacement

**Applicant:** Lars Peterssen, Peterssen/Keller Architecture

**Address of Property:** 20 Park Lane

**Project Name:** V.M.S. Kaufmann House Addition and Remodeling Project  
Rehabilitation Project

**Contact Person and Phone:** Lars Peterssen, (612) 353-4920

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

**Date Application Deemed Complete:** September 13, 2010

**Publication Date:** October 5, 2010

**Public Hearing:** October 12, 2010

**Appeal Period Expiration:** October 22, 2010

**Ward:** 7

**Neighborhood Organization:** Cedar-Isles-Dean

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

**Attachments:**

**Attachment A:** Staff Report (A1-A12)

**Attachment B: Materials submitted by CPED**

- B1: Context Map
- B2: Future Land Use Map
- B3-B4: Aerials
- B5-B6: 1937 Architectural Forum Article
- B7-B10: August 8, 1982 Star Tribune Article
- B11-B14: 1987 Nomination Form
- B15-B20: August 27, 2003 Star Tribune Article
- B21-B34: 1992 HPC Award for a New Addition
- B35-B36: September 5, 1981 Hill and Lake Press Article
- B37: Front Elevation Comparison
- B38: Rear Elevation Comparison

**Attachment C: Materials submitted by Applicant– (C1-C114)**

- C1-C2: Certificate of appropriateness application
- C3-C4: Council member and neighborhood notification
- C5-C7: Applicant zoning review
- C8-C17: Project narrative
- C18-C20: Evaluation of Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

***Proposed Plan Set***

- C21: Proposed Plan Set Title page
- C22: Proposed site plan
- C23-C26: Proposed floor plan set
- C27-C30: Proposed elevations
- C31-C32: Building sections
- C33: Window detail
- C34: Comparison
- C35: Height comparison with neighboring properties

***Historical Development***

- C36-C38: 1991 proposal
- C39-C42: Historic development analysis
- C43-C44: Applicant renderings
- C45-C47: Circa 1988 photographs
- C48-C52: Present photographs

***Landscape Plan***

- C53: Existing site plan
- C54-C55: Proposed site plan and details

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

- 

***Existing Plan Set***

- C56: Existing site plan:
- C57-C60: Existing floor plan set
- C61-C62: Existing elevations

***Other Details***

- C63-C65: Interior remodeling and construction detail
- C66-C71: Structural engineer information
- C72-C95: Contemporary detail images

***Window Information***

- C96-C129: Window narrative, analysis and product information

**Attachment D: Historic Variance Information**

- D1-D3: Historic Variance Application
- D4-D5: Variance Statement

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division



**20 Park Lane:** V.M.S. Kaufmann House, 1937, Source: Peterssen/Keller Architecture

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division



**20 Park Lane:** V.M.S. Kaufmann House, 2010

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

<b>CLASSIFICATION:</b>	
Individual Landmark	V.M.S. Kaufmann House 20 Park Lane
Period of Significance	1935-Present
Criteria of significance	Architecture
Date of local designation	1987
Applicable Design Guidelines	N/A

<b>PROPERTY INFORMATION</b>	
Current name	Lacey Residence
Historic Name	V.M.S. Kaufmann House
Current Address	20 Park Lane
Historic Address	20 Park Lane
Original Construction Date	1935
Original Contractor	Nelson and Benson
Original Architect	Wessel, Brunet & Klein
Historic Use	Residential
Current Use	Residential
Proposed Use	Residential

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

**BACKGROUND:**

Influenced by the examples of modern architecture at the Chicago World's Fair in 1933, V. Mel Kaufmann was determined to build an International style house. He hired architect James Brunet, a recent graduate of the University of Minnesota, to design a home that would capture the theme of "progress" on the shores of Cedar Lake. Surrounded by traditional homes, the modern design with its stucco exterior and flat roof stands out for its architectural distinctiveness. It evokes Le Corbusier's idea of a house as a "Machine for Living" where all superfluous ornamentation is stripped away. Architect Brunet used the latest advances in plumbing, materials and equipment throughout the house. Having been in the first class to be schooled in the "modern design," Brunet designed a prime example of the latest trends in architecture. After the house was built, professors from the University would have bus loads of students come for field trips (City of Minneapolis website).

The house has had four owners. The Kaufmanns lived in the house from 1936-1979. Robert and Julie Weber purchased the house in 1979 and lived there until 1986. In 1987, Penny and John Bynre purchased the property and lived there until 2001. In 2001, the Laceys purchased the property.

The house was designated in April 1987. From the time the house was built to the designation, the Kaufmann House experienced minimal exterior alterations (see Attachment B37-B38). In the later part of 1987, Penny and John Byrne received Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) approval for a second-story addition that included adding a new master bedroom, a new family room, and a roof terrace. The restoration also included a complete replacement of the stucco siding, extensive structural repair, as well as replastering the entire interior. In addition, the kitchen was renovated and expanded to meet the needs of the owner. This 1987 addition, designed by Meyer, Scherer, and Rockcastle, received a 1992 Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission award for a new addition to an historic residential building (Attachment B21-B34).

In November 1990, the Byrnes received Heritage Preservation Commission approval for a third-story addition. However, this addition was not built (Attachment C36-C38).

**SUMMARY OF APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL**

The Applicant states that, "Roger and Neroli Lacey have lived in the V.M.S. Kaufman House on Cedar Lake at 20 Park Lane for ten years, and in that time their family has grown. Both are working professionals and one often works out of the home. The home, which the Lacey's specifically bought for the combination of modern design and it's exceptional location, is an early example of the International Style. When the home was published in Architectural Forum in 1937, the program for the house described as: "PROBLEM: To design a house of use chiefly on the week-ends, by a couple with no children (Attachment B5-B6)." Mr. Peterssen also states that, "In the time our clients have lived there, they have begun to feel the home's limitations. They love the home, but it does not have enough space for a growing and active family (Attachment C8)."

"The renovations and additions that are being proposed by Peterssen/Keller build on the precedents set by the additions designed by MS&R that were subsequently approved by the

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

HPC [in 1991] (Attachment C36-C38). As with the previous alterations, the proposed design matches the material, detail, color, form and style of the original 1936 home. Also, as with the previous MS&R additions, the distinction between new and old is not explicitly clear in every instance. Both the MS&R additions had points where the new additions to the home continued planes of stucco from the existing 1936 home to the new additions. The proposed design exhibits this as well, however it is done in careful and judicious manner.”

The 2010 Certificate of Appropriateness includes five proposed parts.

1. constructing a third-story addition
2. constructing a first floor southwest corner addition
3. enclosing the northwest first floor terrace
4. window replacement
5. landscape redesign

**1. Third-story addition:**

The Applicant is proposing to add a third-story addition that contains 738 square feet of living space (Attachment C26-C30). The addition includes a master suite, which consists of a bedroom, bathroom, closet and dressing area, and a small sitting area with access to a roof terrace overlooking Cedar Lake. A western terrace. The addition would be built with stucco to match the existing stucco (A-200), and glass block windows to reflect original construction. The Applicant had a structural analysis completed, and it was found that the existing structure could support the addition (Attachment C66-C71).

**2. Southwest Corner First floor addition**

The Applicant is proposing to add a guest room on the southwest corner of the first floor (Attachment C24, C29-C30, C89-C90, C94). The addition adds 153 square feet of living space on the first floor. The addition also adds a second floor patio above (Attachment C25). The Applicant states that the addition of the guest room is out of necessity. Normally, this room might have been in a renovated basement. However, as this house has no basement there are very few places to create this needed extra space. Materially it will be rendered in white stucco, and have a similar window pattern to the adjacent kitchen.

**3. Enclosing the north terrace:**

The original 1936 design had a ground level terrace that ran from front to back along the full north size of the house (Attachment B5-B6). This section of the first floor was partially enclosed to form a storage room in the 1989 renovation (Attachment C58, C87, C88). The Applicant is proposing to extend the enclosed portion of the house to the west. However, the Applicant is proposing to expose the original steel column at the northwest corner of the building (Attachment B6).

**4. Window replacement:**

The existing windows, except for the large fixed windows, are early out-swing casement windows and screens made by the Andersen Frame Corp., now the Andersen Corp. The home's windows were made as single units, in very much the same way as casement windows are made today. The significant difference is that these windows have a single pane of glazing. The Applicant would like to replace the windows with vinyl clad out-swing casement windows from the Andersen Corp. that are double glazed with low-E glass, and have advanced weather stripping (Attachment C96).

## **5. Landscape redesign**

The site is primarily open and slopes gently towards the lake. The existing patio is approximately 948 square feet in size (Attachment C53 and C91). The Applicant is proposing to revise the rear patio to be 1502 square feet (Attachment C54). At the rear, a bluestone patio abuts the house and there is a small retaining wall. The patio was installed approximately 15 years ago. Previous photographs of the site confirm that the patio was not original to the home. A small seating area made of limestone flagging exists at the rear of the property adjacent to Cedar Lake. The front yard is comprised of lawn, a mix of plantings, a concrete driveway, and an entry walk. The side yards are defined by a mix of plantings, timber retaining walls, and fencing. Pedestrian walks also extend along the north and south sides of the house for circulation between the front and rear yard. The proposed landscape design is intended to both provide outdoor spaces for the family to enjoy, as well as provide an aesthetic that is sympathetic to the International Style of the home.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Public notices for the Certificate of Appropriateness and Historic Variance application were mailed on or before September 28, 2010. As of October 5, 2010 no public comments have been received.

**CETIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:** Certificate of Appropriateness to rehabilitate the steel fence as part of Phase I of the fence restoration project.

***Findings as required by the Minneapolis Preservation Code:***

*The Planning Division of the Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development Department has analyzed the application based on the findings required by the Minneapolis Preservation Ordinance. Before approving a certificate of appropriateness, and based upon the evidence presented in each application submitted, the commission shall make findings based upon, but not limited to, the following:*

**(1) *The alteration is compatible with and continues to support the criteria of significance and period of significance for which the landmark or historic district was designated.***

The construction of a first floor southwest corner addition and enclosing of the northwest first floor terrace are compatible with criteria of significance and period of significance. The additional living space of these additions provide for an expanded family in a sympathetic way by retaining the scale, massing, and overall character of the V.M.S. Kaufmann House. Both of these additions are proposed to be stepped back from the original construction, which will allow for a distinction between the original and new construction (Attachment C24)

The proposed landscaping project is also compatible with the criteria of significance and period of significance for which the landmark was designated. Although the V.M.S. Kaufmann House did not have a concrete patio, the proposed landscape features in the rear portion of the house continue to connect the house to Cedar Lake.

However, the proposed third-story addition and complete window replacement proposals are not compatible with and do not support the criteria of significance and period of significance for which the landmark was designated. Although the design of the third-story addition respects the original construction, it would overwhelm the original design in scale, size, and massing. The V.M.S. Kaufmann House was designed as a modest residence. The third story addition from the front and Cedar Lake elevations would detract from the original construction by substantially changing the scale, shape, and massing.

The complete window replacement also does not support the criteria of significance. The ribbon windows on the Cedar Lake elevation are a character-defining feature of the building and a significant prototype window.

**(2) *The alteration is compatible with and supports the interior and/or exterior designation in which the property was designated.***

The construction of a first floor southwest corner addition and enclosing of the northwest first floor terrace are compatible with criteria of significance and support the Kaufmann House exterior designation. The additional living space of these additions provide for an

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

expanded family in a sympathetic way by retaining the scale, massing, and overall character of the V.M.S. Kaufmann House.

The proposed landscaping project is also compatible with the exterior designation for which the landmark was designated. Although, the Kaufmann House did not have a large terrace, the proposed terrace does not detract from the building design, shape, and massing.

However, the proposed third-story addition and complete window replacement proposals are not compatible with and do not support the exterior designation. The third-story addition, although the design respects the original construction, would overwhelm the original design in scale, size, and massing. The V.M.S. Kaufmann House was intentionally designed as a modest house. The third story addition would detract from both the front and Cedar Lake elevations.

The complete window replacement also does not support the criteria of significance. The ribbon windows on the Cedar Lake elevation are a character-defining feature of the building and significant in the history of casement window development. In the 1930's Mr. Kaufmann went to the Anderson Window Company with a design for solid glass casement windows without wood mullions. The company said it couldn't be done, but Mel said "try it." The Kaufmann house windows were so satisfactory that Anderson began making them for the national market, and still does today (Attachment B35-B36).

**(3) *The alteration is compatible with and will ensure continued integrity of the landmark or historic district for which the district was designated.***

The V.M.S. Kaufmann House is designated for its architectural design. The character defining features of the international style house include the flat roof, horizontal massing, ribbon windows on the Cedar Lake elevation, and glass block windows. The proposed construction of a first floor southwest corner addition and enclosing of the northwest first floor terrace are compatible with criteria of significance and support the Kaufmann House exterior designation. The additional living space of these additions provide for an expanded family in a sympathetic way by retaining the scale, massing, and overall character of the V.M.S. Kaufmann House.

The proposed landscaping project is also compatible with the exterior designation for which the landmark was designated. Although, the Kaufmann House did not have a large terrace, the proposed terrace does not detract from the building design, shape, and massing.

The proposed third-story addition would have a negative effect on the integrity of design of the building. The third-story addition would overwhelm the scale, size, and massing of the original design.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

The ribbon windows are a character defining feature. Loss of this original feature and building fabric would have a substantial impact on the integrity of design, materials and workmanship of the house.

- (4) *The alteration will not materially impair the significance and integrity of the landmark, historic district or nominated property under interim protection as evidenced by the consistency of alterations with the applicable design guidelines adopted by the commission.***

The V.M.S. Kaufmann House was designated in 1987. No specific design guidelines have been adopted by the Heritage Preservation Commission for the property.

- (5) *The alteration will not materially impair the significance and integrity of the landmark, historic district or nominated property under interim protection as evidenced by the consistency of alterations with the recommendations contained in The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.***

Standard number 2 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties states: "The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided."

The construction of a first floor southwest corner addition and enclosing of the northwest first floor terrace are in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The additional living space of these additions provide for an expanded family in a sympathetic way by retaining the scale, massing, and overall character of the V.M.S. Kaufmann House.

The proposed landscaping project is also in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Although, the Kaufmann House did not have a large terrace, the proposed terrace does not detract from the building design, shape, and massing.

In regard to new additions to historic properties, standard number 9 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties states: "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."

The proposed third-story addition is not in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. While the design respects the original construction, the third story addition would overwhelm the original design in scale, size, and massing. The V.M.S. Kaufmann House was built as a modest residence. The third story addition from the front and Cedar Lake elevations would detract from the original construction and would have a negative impact on the integrity of design of the house.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

Standard number 6 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties states: "Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."

The complete window replacement is not in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The ribbon windows on the Cedar Lake elevation are a character-defining feature of the building and significant in the history of casement window development. These important pieces of historic fabric should be repaired and rehabilitated, rather than replaced.

- (6) *The certificate of appropriateness conforms to all applicable regulations of this preservation ordinance and is consistent with the applicable policies of the comprehensive plan and applicable preservation policies in small area plans adopted by the city council.***

Policy 8.1.1 of the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth indicates that the City shall protect historic resources from modifications that are not sensitive to their historic significance. The proposed first floor addition and terrace enclosure, as well as the proposed landscape improvements, would be in keeping with this policy. This is evidenced by their compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

The proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> story addition and window replacement, which are not in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, would not be in keeping with this policy.

- (7) *Destruction of any property. Before approving a certificate of appropriateness that involves 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. The commission may delay a final decision for a reasonable period of time to allow parties interested in preserving the property a reasonable opportunity to act to protect it.***

The project does not constitute the destruction of the subject property.

***Before approving a certificate of appropriateness, and based upon the evidence presented in each application submitted, the commission shall make findings that alterations are proposed in a manner that demonstrates that the applicant has made adequate consideration of the following documents and regulations:***

**(8) Adequate consideration of the description and statement of significance in the original nomination upon which designation of the landmark or historic district was based.**

The Applicant submitted materials addressing the description and statement of significance in the original nomination (See Appendix C-9 – C-17). While it is clear that the Applicant did make consideration of the description and statement of significance in the original nomination when designing the project, staff does not agree with their assessment that the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> story addition and replacement of original windows would not have an impact on the integrity of the property. As outlined in finding #3 of this report, staff finds that these aspects of the proposed project would have an impact on the integrity of design, materials, and workmanship.

**(9) Where applicable, Adequate consideration of Title 20 of the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances, Zoning Code, Chapter 530, Site Plan Review.**

Title 20 of the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances, Zoning Code, Chapter 530, Site Plan Review will not regulate the proposed work.

The proposed addition does not meet the zoning code requirement for window coverage because glass block windows are not counted towards meeting this requirement. This subject is explored fully in the Historic Variance application that is also under consideration for this property.

**(10) The typology of treatments delineated in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and the associated guidelines for preserving, rehabilitating, reconstructing, and restoring historic buildings.**

The Applicant submitted materials addressing the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (See Appendix C-18 – C-20). As outlined in finding #5 of this report, staff does not find the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> story addition or replacement of original windows to be in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

CPED-Planning staff recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission **adopt** staff findings and **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following condition(s):

1. The third-story addition is not approved as part of this application.
2. The original ribbon casement windows on the Cedar Lake elevation shall be rehabilitated rather than replaced.
3. The proposed vinyl clad replacement windows are not allowed.
4. The Applicant shall receive final HPC approval on the proposed windows.
5. CPED-Planning Preservation Staff shall review and approve the final plans and elevations prior to building permit issuance.
6. The Certificate of Appropriateness 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.