

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS**  
**CPED PLANNING DIVISION**  
**HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**  
BZH #25904

---

---

FILE NAME: 139 Cecil Street SE

CATEGORY/DISTRICT: Prospect Park Historic District (Interim Protection)

CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness

APPLICANT: Gregor Adriany, 612-623-3239

DATE OF APPLICATION: May 12, 2009

PUBLICATION DATE: June 30, 2009

DATE OF HEARING: July 7, 2009

APPEAL PERIOD EXPIRATION: July 17, 2009

STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Chris Vrchota, (612) 673-5467

REQUEST: Building Alteration and Addition

---

---

**A. SITE DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND:**

139 Cecil St SE is a 1.5 story residence designed in the Arts and Crafts style. The house is located in the Prospect Park Historic District, which is currently under interim protection pending the completion of a designation study.

According to the local nomination and the National Register of Historic Places nomination prepared and submitted by Hess, Roise, and Company, the Prospect Park Historic District is locally significant for its depiction of social history, community planning, architecture, and landscape architecture during the period 1883-1965.

As stated in the nomination prepared by Hess, Roise, and Company, Prospect Park's social history significance stems from its exhibition of characteristics common to early twentieth century suburban development. Prospect Park remained sparsely settled until the installation of the first inter-urban street railway along University Avenue in 1890. Curvilinear streets built along wooded hillsides stand out in this relatively level city built primarily in a grid network.

Home to the first neighborhood association in the City, the Prospect Park Improvement Association, the neighborhood is also associated with prominent forces in Minneapolis' early development: the University of Minnesota and numerous residents important to the City's development such as Robert Taylor Jones, and Lowell Lamoreaux.

Hess, Roise, and Company determined that the exterior of the building at 139 Cecil Street SE contributes to the district's significance. The house was built by Peters Home Building Co. in 1915 and is representative of the Arts and Crafts architectural style and development characteristic of the neighborhood.

## **B. PROPOSED CHANGES:**

The main change being proposed by the Applicant is the construction of a 14'-8" x 14 single story addition to the rear of the house. This addition would mirror an addition built onto the rear of the house in 1953. The addition would be used to expand the kitchen and dining room area.

The Applicant is also proposing to make some changes to the 1953 addition. These include constructing a new roof over the structure to match the style and pitch of the proposed addition (see Appendix F-5), the replacement of a double hung window with a shorter three wide configuration on the side of the addition (see Appendix F-4), and the replacement of a small double hung window with a set of side-by-side double hung windows on the rear of the addition (see Appendix F-5).

The final exterior changes would be to the north (side) elevation of the house. This would involve removing an existing window and replacing it with a new window further towards the rear of the house (see appendix F-4) and the installation of a 4" vent pipe. Both of these changes would be made to accommodate the renovation of the interior kitchen space.

## **C. FINDINGS REQUIRED FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:**

### **Certificate of Appropriateness**

***In general. 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.**

According to the local nomination and the National Register of Historic Places nomination prepared and submitted by Hess, Roise, and Company, the Prospect Park Historic District is locally significant for its depiction of social history, community planning, architecture, and landscape architecture during the period 1883-1965.

Hess, Roise, and Company determined that the exterior portions of the residence at 139 Cecil Street SE contribute to the district's significance. The proposed changes will not impact the criteria of significance for the potential historic district because the work would be done on non-primary elevations and would be done in a complimentary way.

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

Hess, Roise, and Company determined that the exterior portions of the residence at 139 Cecil Street SE contribute to the district's significance. The proposed work can be done in a manner that will be compatible with the elements of the property that make it a contributing resource in the Prospect Park potential historic district. This is being accomplished by limiting the changes

to non-primary elevations, matching existing materials, and building the addition at a scale that is appropriate for the property.

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

Both the City of Minneapolis' Heritage Preservation Regulations and the National Register of Historic Places identify integrity as the authenticity of historic properties and recognize seven aspects that define a property's integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. Based upon the evidence provided below, the proposed work would not impair the integrity of the contributing resource (residence).

*Location:* The Applicant is not proposing to change the contributing resource's location, thus the project will not impair the contributing resource's integrity of location.

*Design:* The Applicant is proposing to add an addition to the rear of the property, make changes to windows on a rear addition to the house, and move one window on a side elevation. All work is being done on non-primary facades and will be done in a manner that is complimentary to the original design of the house. The changes will not impair the contributing resource's integrity of design.

*Setting:* The Applicant is not proposing any off-site changes, and the changes being proposed would be compatible with the property and the district. The project will not impair the contributing resource's integrity of setting.

*Materials:* The Applicant is proposing to add a single-story addition to the rear of the house and to replace a total of 3 windows on the property. The addition would be sided with the same combed cedar siding found on the rest of the house. The new windows would be wood double hung replacements, similar to the style of those found on the rest of the house in size and profile. The proposed work would not impair the contributing resource's integrity of materials.

*Workmanship:* Staff has conditioned an approval that requires that the proposed work meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. As conditioned, the work would not impair the contributing resource's integrity of workmanship.

*Feeling:* The Applicant is proposing to add an addition to the rear of the property and to make window modifications on other non-primary elevations. The addition would mirror an existing addition to the rear of the property, and the proposed changes to the windows would be in keeping with the style and design of windows on the property- wood double hung windows- which are common throughout the district. The project will not impair the property's integrity of feeling.

*Association:* As conditioned, the project will not impair the property's integrity of association.

**(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 Heritage Preservation Commission has not yet adopted guidelines for the Prospect Park Historic District.

**(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.**

The Guidelines for windows in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are most applicable to the proposed project.

In regard to new additions to properties, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation recommend the following: "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"; and "Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an inconspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building".

In this case, the proposed addition is on the rear of the property. The rear features few historic or character defining materials which could be obscured, damaged or destroyed. Additionally, the rear of the property is well screened from the street, minimizing the visual impact of the addition. The one story addition would be lower than the main structure of the house, further minimizing the impact of the addition. This is in keeping with The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

In regard to windows, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation recommend "Designing and installing additional windows on rear or other-non character-defining elevations if required by the new use. New window openings may also be cut into exposed party walls. Such design should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character-defining elevation." The applicant is proposing to replace windows on two sides of an addition to the rear of the property, and to move and replace one window in the main structure to allow for the reconfiguration of the kitchen. All proposed work is being done on non-primary facades, in areas that are well screened and have low visibility from the street. This is in keeping with The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

**(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.**

The proposed alterations are considered a major alteration and require a Certificate of Appropriateness application.

As conditioned, the project would comply policy 8.1.1 of The Minneapolis Plan, which states: “Protect historic resources from modifications that are not sensitive to their historic significance.”

***Adequate consideration of related documents and regulations.*** 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:

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

See above analysis, findings 1 and 2. Per the nomination prepared by Hess, Roise and Company, Prospect Park is “locally significant for its depiction of social history, community planning, architecture, and landscape architecture during the period 1883-1965.” The proposed addition to the rear of the house and changes to one window on the original structure and windows on two sides of an existing addition would not have an impact on the significance of the district.

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

Per the material submitted by the applicant addressing the required findings (section 2.6 of Appendix D-2), the Applicant has made adequate consideration of the compliance of the project with all applicable requirements of the Zoning Code.

**(9) 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 proposed work falls under the scope of rehabilitation. The proposed addition and window replacement would be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

***Additional findings for alterations within historic districts.*** Before approving a certificate of appropriateness that involves alterations to a property within an historic district, the commission shall make findings based upon, but not limited to, the following:

**(10) The alteration is compatible with and will ensure continued significance and integrity of all contributing properties in the historic district based on the period of significance for which the district was designated.**

The alterations would be compatible with and will ensure the continued significance and integrity of all contributing properties in the historic district based on the period of significance for which the district was designated. The proposed changes are being made to non-primary elevations and in a manner that is compatible with the existing structure and the district. The

proposed work would be in keeping with The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, as demonstrated in finding #5 of this analysis.

**(11) Granting the certificate of appropriateness will be in keeping with the spirit and intent of the ordinance and will not negatively alter the essential character of the historic district.**

The spirit and intent of the City of Minneapolis' Heritage Preservation Regulations is to preserve historically significant buildings, structures, sites, objects, districts, and cultural landscapes of the community while permitting appropriate changes to be made to these properties. The Applicant is proposing to construct an addition on the rear of the property and make alterations to a number of windows on the property. As conditioned, the project complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and would not negatively alter the essential character of the historic district, because the proposed work would be done on non-primary elevations and would be done in a manner that is compatible with the subject property and the potential historic district.

**(12) The certificate of appropriateness will not be injurious to the significance and integrity of other resources in the historic district and will not impede the normal and orderly preservation of surrounding resources as allowed by regulations in the preservation ordinance.**

The proposed work is confined to the subject property, and the changes would be made in a manner so as to be in keeping with the original architectural design of the property. The proposal will not be injurious to the significance and integrity of other resources in the historic district and will not impede the normal and orderly preservation of surrounding resources as allowed by regulations in the preservation ordinance.

**D. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission **adopt** staff findings and **approve** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work subject to the following conditions:

1. All materials and workmanship must meet the Secretary of Interior Standards.
2. CPED-Planning Preservation Staff shall review and approve the final plans and elevations prior to building permit issuance.

**Attachments**

- A. Vicinity Map (Prepared by staff)
- B. Application (Submitted by Applicant)
- C. Project Description (Submitted by Applicant)
- D. Statement Addressing Required Findings (Submitted by Applicant)
- E. Site Photographs (Submitted by Applicant)
- F. Site Plan and Building Elevations (Submitted by Applicant)