

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

FILE NAME: 1920 3rd Avenue South (BZH 25486)
CATEGORY/DISTRICT: Contributing structure to the Stevens Square Historic District
CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness
APPLICANT: Lisa Germann, Project Manager
DATE OF APPLICATION: August 14, 2008
PUBLICATION DATE: August 8, 2008
DATE OF HEARING: August 14, 2008
APPEAL PERIOD EXPIRATION : August 25, 2008
STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Aaron Hanauer (612) 673-2494

A. SITE DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND:

The property located at 1920 Third Avenue South is a contributing building in the Stevens Square Historic District. The Steven's Square Historic District is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is a locally designated district. The three-story brick apartment building was built in 1915 by Fleisher Rose Construction Company for Samuel Fleisher. The building to the north, 1926 3rd Avenue South, is a sister building that contains many of the architectural details as the subject building.

The exterior building material of the front elevation and the first 10 feet of the side elevations is a dark brick with varying shades. Beyond the first 10 feet of the side elevations the exterior building material of the side and rear elevations is a yellowish-gray brick. The building displays a prominent cornice that extends to the edge of the red brick and quoins that contrast the red brick.

The applicant is applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness to complete interior and exterior work. For the proposed work the applicant is applying for federal funding and a Section 106 Review is taking place. The applicant has submitted a Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Scope of Work form to describe the work that is proposed for the Certificate of Appropriateness. Note: Work Items #12-20 are interior work and are not part of this application. Also, SHPO's historical architect, Mark Buechel, reviewed the project and provided comments (see Appendix C).

B. WINDOWS: SASH AND FRAMES (Work Scope # 1, #2, and #3)

DESCRIPTION: There are 143 window openings and currently 134 windows (there are 9 basement window openings that have been infilled with brick, plywood or mechanical louvers). All windows on the first three floors are wood double-hung windows. The windows along the primary elevation are four-over-one double hung windows. The windows on the side and rear elevations are one-over-one double hung windows. The applicant estimates that 10 percent of the windows are replacement wood sash windows with vinyl jamb liners. Exterior window surfaces are painted off-white and have an aluminum storm window.

WINDOW CONDITION ANALYSIS: The applicant provided a selective window condition analysis, window restoration cost estimates, and four replacement estimates as part of their application (see Appendix A8 and A9). For the selective window condition analysis, the windows chosen for the condition review are said to be, “A good representation of the windows building wide (see Appendix A110).” From the review, the applicant and the applicant’s window consultant, Crossroad Construction, stated that the windows are in poor condition and beyond reconditioning (see Appendix A3 and A109). The applicant points out that the sash rails and jamb wood is deteriorated and that there are damaged or missing muntins (see Appendix A3).

In addition to the window condition analysis, the applicant provided two window restoration cost estimates. The window restoration cost estimates were provided by Crossroad Construction Company and Flannery Construction (Appendix A110 and A111). The restoration cost estimates for the 134 windows were \$208,000 and \$214,000. The applicant also received three estimates for the sash replacements and one estimate for full replacement (see Appendix A7). The replacement cost estimates ranged from \$107,000 (Aluminum: Quaker, Pamela Series) to \$214,000 (Aluminum Clad: Peach Tree, 700 Series). The applicant chose the Quaker Pamela Series for the proposed window replacement of the windows on the top three floors.

PROPOSED WORK: In general, replacement windows are designed to be installed in one of two ways: either as a complete unit replacement (sash and frame) or as a partial replacement that replaces only the sash. For partial replacement there are two options. One is to replace the existing sash with a new sash. The other method involves attaching a panning frame over the exterior parts of the existing frame, caulking the perimeter, and then replacing the sash.

The applicant has proposed the method of partial replacement that includes applying aluminum panning over the wood frame and replacing the sash. The brand and model of the replacement windows is the Pamela Series from Quaker. The replacements sashes are aluminum with a white finish. The applicant states that the mullion covers, panning, and arches would match existing as closely as possible (see Appendix A11 and A115). The operation of the windows would change from double-hung to single-hung. The replacement windows on the top three floors of the east elevation are proposed to be four-over-one simulated divided lights with muntins applied to window exterior (see Appendix A93 for simulated light details).

The applicant has altered their plans for the basement windows as laid out in Work Scope item #3 (see Appendix A12 and Appendix D). The applicant plans to replace the double-hung basement windows on the east elevation and two basement windows on the south elevation with single-hung windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The windows on the front elevation, with the four-over-one, true divided lights, are a character defining feature of the building. Replacing the windows and wrapping the wood frames with aluminum panning would significantly alter the look of the building. The building at 1926 3rd Avenue South, which is similar to 1920 3rd Avenue South, received approval for a window replacement similar to what is proposed for 1920 3rd Avenue South. After reviewing the completed work, staff believes that the alteration substantially alters the building (see Appendix B). The information provided by the applicant demonstrates that the windows are in need of repair, but the applicant has not proved that the windows are beyond repair.

The windows on the side and rear elevations are one-over-one double hung windows. The side windows are characteristic of the apartment/condo buildings in Steven’s Square, but they are less visible from the street. The proposed window replacement for the side elevation with panning

will also alter the look of the building. In addition, panning over the wood is not a recommended course of action in particular when window frames are in need of repair work.

C. WINDOWS: LINTELS AND SILLS (Work Scope # 4 and #5)

DESCRIPTION/CONDITION ANALYSIS/PROPOSAL: The applicant states that the lintels are generally in fair condition, but there are six that have rust built up between the steel and masonry above. The lintels with the built-up rust are proposed to be replaced and the others will be repaired.

The primary elevation contains cast stone window sills. The applicant states that the cast-stone sills show signs of deterioration consistent with the age of the building (Appendix A13). The applicant proposes to replace existing sills with sills that are similar in size, profile, color, and overall appearance.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The rust removal and repainting of lintels meets the Secretary of Interior Standards. However, the replacement of the cast stone sills does not meet the Secretary of Interior Standard since it has not been demonstrated that they are beyond repair.

D. BUILDING ENTRIES (Work Scope #6 and #7)

DESCRIPTION/CONDITION ANALYSIS/PROPOSAL: The main entrance is a replacement door with two sidelights. There are non-original sconce fixtures flanking the primary entry door. The door is in good condition and the applicant proposes to repaint and maintain the existing door and replace the sconce fixtures flanking the primary door.

The west elevation (rear elevation) contains a replacement metal door and frame with plywood panel covering former sidelights. The door has some rust/damage at the bottom. The applicant proposes to replace the existing door with a metal door with a door that contains a square light to match existing (see Appendix A14 and A52).

STAFF ANALYSIS: The primary entrance is not in character with the building, however, the proposed work to this door does not go against the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. The proposed rear elevation door is also not in character with the building and does not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. The applicant must use historical, pictorial, and physical documentation in choosing a new rear door for the rear elevation that is more in character with the building.

E. CORNICE (Work Scope #8)

DESCRIPTION/CONDITION ANALYSIS/PROPOSAL: A traditional cornice on the primary building elevation extends approximately 10 feet on the north and south elevation. The cornice is in good condition overall but some dentils are missing and some cracks are visible from ground. The applicant proposes to replace the missing dentils and repair cracks and repaint entire cornice.

STAFF ANALYSIS: Applicant's proposal is acceptable and will meet the Secretary of Interior Standards if the replacement dentils match existing in size, shape, material, and color.

F. MASONRY (Work Scope #9 and #10)

DESCRIPTION/CONDITION ANALYSIS/PROPOSAL: The applicant states that the condition of the brick is fair with deterioration/damage primarily below window sills and at the roof line on the north side. There is mismatched mortar below several sills on the east elevation. The applicant proposes to repoint mortar joints. The applicant also proposes to repoint mortar joints and to have new mortar match original in composition, color, texture, and tooling. The applicant also proposes to replace brick that will match original as close as possible.

STAFF ANALYSIS: Applicant's proposal meets the Secretary of Interior Standards. SHPO's historical architect, Mark Buechel, added that the hardness of the historic mortar should match existing (see Appendix C).

G. STEEL FIRE ESCAPE (Work Scope #11)

DESCRIPTION/CONDITION ANALYSIS/PROPOSAL: There is a steel fire escape on the rear elevation. The applicant states that it is in poor condition. The applicant proposes to remove the fire escape and repair masonry at former anchor points.

ANALYSIS: The removal of the fire escape on the rear addition is an acceptable alteration. The steel fire escape is on the rear elevation of the building and has little visibility from 3rd Avenue or Franklin Avenue.

H. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:

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

Windows

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving windows - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Such features can include frames, sash, muntins, glazing, sills, heads, hoodmolds, paneled or decorated jambs and moldings, and interior and exterior shutters and blinds.

Protecting and maintaining the wood and architectural metal which comprise the window frame, sash, muntins, and surrounds through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems.

Making windows weather tight by recaulking and replacing or installing weather-stripping. These actions also improve thermal efficiency.

Evaluating the overall condition of materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, i.e. if repairs to windows and window features will be required.

Repairing window frames and sash by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing. Such repair may also include replacement in kind of those parts that are either extensively deteriorated or are missing when there are surviving prototypes such as architraves, hoodmolds, sash, sills, and interior or exterior shutters and blinds.

Replacing in kind an entire window that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. If using the same

kind of materials is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Designing and installing new windows when the historic windows (frame, sash and glazing) are completely missing. The replacement windows may 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.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

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.

Providing a setback in the design of dropped ceilings when they are required for the new use to allow for the full height of the window openings.

Not Recommended:

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

Changing the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows, through cutting new openings, blocking-in windows, and installing replacement sash which does not fit the historic window opening.

Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which radically change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of the glazing; or the appearance of the frame.

Obscuring historic window trim with metal or other material.

Stripping windows of historic material such as wood, iron, cast iron, and bronze.

Failing to provide adequate protection of materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of the windows results.

Retrofitting or replacing windows rather than maintaining the sash, frame, and glazing.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of historic windows.

Replacing an entire window when repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

Failing to reuse serviceable window hardware such as brass lifts and sash locks.

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

Removing a character-defining window that is unrepairable and blocking it in; or replacing it with a new window that does not convey the same visual appearance.

Design for Missing Historic Features

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

Introducing a new design that is incompatible with the historic character of the building.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Installing new windows, including frames, sash, and muntin configuration that are incompatible with the building's historic appearance or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

Inserting new floors or furred-down ceilings which cut across the glazed areas of the windows so that the exterior form and appearance of the windows are changed.

Entrances and Porches

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving entrances - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as doors, fanlights, sidelights, pilasters, entablatures, columns, balustrades, and stairs.

Protecting and maintaining the masonry, wood, and architectural metal that comprise entrances and porches through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems.

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

Repairing entrances and porches by reinforcing the historic materials. Repair will also generally include the limited replacement in kind - or with compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of repeated features where there are surviving prototypes such as balustrades, cornices, entablatures, columns, sidelights, and stairs.

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

Design for Missing Historic Features

Designing and constructing a new entrance or porch if the historic entrance or porch is completely missing. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Designing enclosures for historic porches when required by the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building. This can include using large sheets of glass and recessing the enclosure wall behind existing scrollwork, posts, and balustrades.

Designing and installing additional entrances or porches when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building, i.e., limiting such alteration to non-character-defining elevations.

Not Recommended:

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

Stripping entrances and porches of historic material such as wood, iron, cast iron, terra cotta, tile and brick.

Removing an entrance or porch because the building has been reoriented to accommodate a new use.

Cutting new entrances on a primary elevation.

Altering utilitarian or service entrances so they appear to be formal entrances by adding paneled doors, fanlights, and sidelights.

Failing to provide adequate protection to materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of entrances and porches results.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of historic entrances and porches.

Replacing an entire entrance or porch when the repair of materials and limited replacement of parts are appropriate.

Using a substitute material for the replacement parts that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the entrance and porch or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Removing an entrance or porch that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new entrance or porch that does not convey the same visual appearance.

Design for Missing Historic Features

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

Introducing a new entrance or porch that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Enclosing porches in a manner that results in a diminution or loss of historic character such as using solid materials such as wood, stucco, or masonry.

Installing secondary service entrances and porches that are incompatible in size and scale with the historic building or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

Masonry: *Brick, stone, terra cotta, concrete, adobe, stucco, and mortar*

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving masonry features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as walls, brackets, railings, cornices, window architraves, door pediments, steps, and columns; and joint and unit size, tooling and bonding patterns, coatings, and color.

Protecting and maintaining masonry by providing proper drainage so that water does not stand on flat, horizontal surfaces or accumulate in curved decorative features.

Cleaning masonry only when necessary to halt deterioration or remove heavy soiling.

Carrying out masonry surface cleaning tests after it has been determined that such cleaning is necessary. Tests should be observed over a sufficient period of time so that both the immediate effects and the long range effects are known to enable selection of the gentlest method possible.

Cleaning masonry surfaces with the gentlest method possible, such as low pressure water and detergents, using natural bristle brushes.

Inspecting painted masonry surfaces to determine whether repainting is necessary.

Removing damaged or deteriorated paint only to the next sound layer using the gentlest method possible (e.g., hand scraping) prior to repainting.

Applying compatible paint coating systems following proper surface preparation.

Repainting with colors that are historically appropriate to the building and district.

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

Repairing masonry walls and other masonry features by repointing the mortar joints where there is evidence of deterioration such as disintegrating mortar, cracks in mortar joints, loose bricks, damp walls, or damaged plasterwork.

Removing deteriorated mortar by carefully hand-raking the joints to avoid damaging the masonry.

Duplicating old mortar in strength, composition, color, and texture.

Duplicating old mortar joints in width and in joint profile.

Repairing stucco by removing the damaged material and patching with new stucco that duplicates the old in strength, composition, color, and texture.

Using mud plaster as a surface coating over unfired, unstabilized adobe because the mud plaster will bond to the adobe.

Repairing masonry features by patching, piecing-in, or consolidating the masonry using recognized preservation methods. Repair may also include the limited replacement in kind - or with compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of masonry features when there are surviving prototypes such as terra-cotta brackets or stone balusters.

Applying new or non-historic surface treatments such as water-repellent coatings to masonry only after repointing and only if masonry repairs have failed to arrest water penetration problems.

Replacing in kind an entire masonry feature that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. Examples can include large sections of a wall, a cornice, balustrade, column, or stairway. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Designing and installing a new masonry feature such as steps or a door pediment when the historic feature is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

Not Recommended:

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

Replacing or rebuilding a major portion of exterior masonry walls that could be repaired so that, as a result, the building is no longer historic and is essentially new construction.

Applying paint or other coatings such as stucco to masonry that has been historically unpainted or uncoated to create a new appearance.

Removing paint from historically painted masonry.

Radically changing the type of paint or coating or its color.

Failing to evaluate and treat the various causes of mortar joint deterioration such as leaking roofs or gutters, differential settlement of the building, capillary action, or extreme weather exposure.

Cleaning masonry surfaces when they are not heavily soiled to create a new appearance, thus needlessly introducing chemicals or moisture into historic materials.

Cleaning masonry surfaces without testing or without sufficient time for the testing results to be of value.

Sandblasting brick or stone surfaces using dry or wet grit or other abrasives. These methods of cleaning permanently erode the surface of the material and accelerate deterioration.

Using a cleaning method that involves water or liquid chemical solutions when there is any possibility of freezing temperatures.

Cleaning with chemical products that will damage masonry, such as using acid on limestone or marble, or leaving chemicals on masonry surfaces.

Applying high pressure water cleaning methods that will damage historic masonry and the mortar joints.

Removing paint that is firmly adhering to, and thus protecting, masonry surfaces.

Using methods of removing paint which are destructive to masonry, such as sandblasting, application of caustic solutions, or high pressure waterblasting.

Failing to follow manufacturers' product and application instructions when repainting masonry.

Using new paint colors that are inappropriate to the historic building and district.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of masonry features.

Removing non-deteriorated mortar from sound joints, then repointing the entire building to achieve a uniform appearance.

Using electric saws and hammers rather than hand tools to remove deteriorated mortar from joints prior to repointing.

Repointing with mortar of high portland cement content (unless it is the content of the historic mortar). This can often create a bond that is stronger than the historic material and can cause damage as a result of the differing coefficient of expansion and the differing porosity of the material and the mortar.

Repointing with a synthetic caulking compound.

Using a "scrub" coating technique to repoint instead of traditional repointing methods.

Changing the width or joint profile when repointing.

Removing sound stucco; or repairing with new stucco that is stronger than the historic material or does not convey the same visual appearance.

Applying cement stucco to unfired, unstabilized adobe. Because the cement stucco will not bond properly, moisture can become entrapped between materials, resulting in accelerated deterioration of the adobe.

Replacing an entire masonry feature such as a cornice or balustrade when repair of the masonry and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

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

Applying waterproof, water-repellent, or non-historic coatings such as stucco to masonry as a substitute for repointing and masonry repairs. Coatings are frequently unnecessary, expensive, and may change the appearance of historic masonry as well as accelerate its deterioration.

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

Design for Missing Historic Features

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

Introducing a new masonry feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

2. STEVENS SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT GUIDELINES

II. Guidelines For Rehabilitation of Buildings

A. Masonry Repair.

1. No exterior sandblasting is permitted.
2. Chemical cleaning is not permitted on glazed brick or terra-cotta, limestone, marble, or other masonry material susceptible to damage from chemical exposure.
3. Repointing of joints shall be done with a mortar design similar to the original. Joints shall be tooled to match original profile.

B. Window Replacement/Repair.

1. Windows shall have clear glass unless historical documentation is presented which shows patterned or opaque glass.
2. Anodized aluminum finished are not permitted.
3. Mullion patterns will match original. Replacement windows shall replicate original window operation.
4. Exterior windows should not be blocked or obscured from the interior. Exceptions may be granted for windows on secondary facades if a special case can be made for the necessity of such an alteration.

C. Wood trim and siding.

1. All exterior wood shall be painted, including decks, unless historical documentation demonstrates otherwise.
2. Deteriorated wood siding shall be replaced with wood siding. Aluminum, vinyl, and other synthetic siding will not be allowed.

E. Removal of historic fabric.

Selective removal of original building materials are allowed when deterioration has occurred or for remodeling as part of an adaptive use. HPC approval is required for any removal of historic building materials.

I. FINDINGS:

1. 1920 3rd Avenue South is a contributing structure to the Steven's Square Historic District
2. The Steven's Square Historic District is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is a local historic district.
3. The applicant proposes to replace all windows on the top three stories and some windows on the basement level. As proposed, these alterations do not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation nor the Steven's Square Historic District Guidelines.
4. The applicant proposes to replace the window sills and rear door. As proposed, the replacement work does not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.
5. The applicant proposes to do repair work on the cornice, masonry, and remove the rear elevation fire escape. If the conditions of approval below are included in the scope of work, the proposed work would meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Steven's Square Historic District Guidelines.

J. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the HPC adopt staff findings and **approve** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the window replacement and exterior work with the following conditions.

1. CPED-Planning review and approve final site plan, floor plans, and elevations.
2. Windows on (primary) elevation east are repaired rather than replaced;
3. A sash replacement is allowed for side and rear elevations if it meets the following conditions.
 - New sash shall have same profile as existing window;
 - Windows shall have clear glass;
 - Window color shall match color of existing window trim;
 - Windows shall not be anodized aluminum;
 - Windows shall be double-hung windows;
 - Wrapping of windows shall not be allowed.
4. Window sills are repaired rather than replaced;
5. The proposed rear elevation door is not approved.
6. The replacement cornice dentils shall match the size color, and other details of existing dentils;
7. The mortar work shall match the original in composition, color, texture, and hardness.
8. Approval is subject to successful completion of the 106 process of SHPO.

K. APPENDIX:

Appendix A: Application

Appendix B: Window replacement comparison

Appendix C: SHPO comments

Appendix D: Additional Application Information