

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

Certificate of Appropriateness
BZH-27057

Date: October 25, 2011

Proposal: Amended Certificate of Appropriateness for building and site modifications.

Applicant: Shea, Inc.

Address of Property: 1121 Hennepin Avenue

Project Name: Butcher & the Boar Restaurant

Contact Person and Phone: Cori Kuechenmeister, 612-339-2257

Planning Staff and Phone: Chris Vrchota, 612-673-5467

Date Application Deemed Complete: October 11, 2011

Publication Date: October 18, 2011

Public Hearing: October 25, 2011

Appeal Period Expiration: November 4, 2011

Ward: Ward 7

Neighborhood Organization: Citizens for a Loring Park Community

Concurrent Review: N/A

Attachments: Appendix A: Materials submitted by CPED staff –

- 350' map (A-1)
- Harmon Place Historic District Map (A-2)

Appendix B: Materials submitted by Applicant –

- Notification to Council Member & Neighborhood Group (B-1)
- Application form (B-2 – B-3)
- Statement of Proposed Use / Project Description (B-4)
- Applicants Findings Responses (B-5 – B-11)
- Photos from Applicant (B-12 – B-33)
- Plan drawings and specifications (B-34 – B-56)

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division



**1121 Hennepin Avenue Subject Property- Present Day- Looking from West
Photo Submitted by Applicant**

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

CLASSIFICATION:	
Local Historic District	Harmon Place Historic District
Period of Significance	1907-1930
Criteria of significance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Broad patterns of economic history (automotive industry in Minneapolis); ▪ Architecture
Date of local designation	2001
Applicable Design Guidelines	Harmon Place Historic District Design Guidelines, Secretary of Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties, Design Guidelines for On-Premise Signs and Awnings

PROPERTY INFORMATION	
Current name	Commercial Building
Historic Name	N/A
Current Address	1121 Hennepin Avenue S
Historic Address	1121 Hennepin Avenue S
Original Construction Date	1956
Original Contractor	Roy Nelson
Original Architect	Magney, Tusler & Setter
Historic Use	Gas Station (Demolished at an unknown date)
Current Use	Commercial (Office)
Proposed Use	Commercial (Restaurant)

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

BACKGROUND:

The subject property is a modern one-story office building. The front façade is clad in polished stone, while the remainder of the building features plain concrete block. The front door is the only opening on the front of the building, which faces Hennepin Avenue. There is a 4 bay concrete block garage at the rear of the property, facing the alley.

The building is a non-contributing resource in the district because it was constructed 26 years after the period of significance for the Harmon Place Historic District.

The Heritage Preservation Commission reviewed a Certificate of Appropriateness application for this property on September 13, 2011. The Commission approved the project, though certain elements, including proposed gabion rock screening walls, the gate to the rear courtyard, and signage over the gate, were not approved.

The Applicant has applied for a new Certificate of Appropriateness for the project. They have submitted new plans for the proposed screening walls, rear entry gate and signage. Additionally, they are proposing changes to the previously approved modifications to the front (west) elevation of the building.

SUMMARY OF APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL:

The Applicant has submitted revised plans for the project. Changes include:

- Continuing the screening fence approved for use on the south side of the parking lot to the west parking lot entrance. This would be in place of the previously proposed gabion rock wall, which was not approved.
- A new 7' tall screening wall at the southeast corner of the building. The proposed wall would be made from hot-rolled metal, similar to that used to cap the fence screening the parking lot. This would be in place of the previously proposed gabion rock wall, which was not approved.
- A new gate to the rear courtyard area. The gate is designed to have a similar appearance to the previously approved new front door on the west elevation. The previously proposed gate design was not approved.
- A new sign above the proposed gate. The previously proposed sign was not approved.
- Removal of the previously proposed and approved folding curtain window system on the west elevation. The Applicant is now proposing to omit this window, leaving the existing marble face in tact.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comment had been received by the time of publication.

CETIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS: Amended Certificate of Appropriateness for building and site modifications.

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.*

According to *The Harmon Place Historic District Final Report*, prepared by Carolle Zellie, Landscape Research, the Harmon Place Historic District is locally significant for its depiction of auto-related commercial development and automotive architecture during the period 1907-1930.

The subject property is a non-contributing resource in the Harmon Place Historic District, because it was constructed after the district's period of significance. Because the subject site is a non-contributing resource in the district, concerns about the potential impacts of the proposed work are focused primarily on how it would impact the adjacent buildings and the district as a whole, rather than how it impacts the subject site.

The proposed modifications are in keeping with this finding. The proposed alterations to the building would be in keeping with the design and character of the building, without having a significant impact on the overall character of the district.

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

The Harmon Place Historic District is significant for its history as being the "heart of the Minneapolis automotive district for over fifty years¹". It is also significant for its collection and representation of automotive oriented architecture. The designation study states, "the historic district boundaries reflect the general edges and sense of place long associated with the core of the city's automotive district²".

The subject building is non-contributing, constructed significantly after the period of significance. The proposed alterations are in keeping with the character and period for the subject property.

¹ Carole Zellie, *The Harmon Place Historic District- Final Report*. 2001. p.1

² Ibid, p2.

(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 impact but not impair the integrity of the district.

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 proposed building alterations are sensitive to the original design and style of this mid century building, and would not impact the integrity of design.

Setting: The proposed screening walls are in keeping with the character for the subject building, though not entirely with that of the district. The proposed metal screening wall is located at a rear corner of the building, which would limit its visibility. This would have an impact on the integrity of setting, though not a substantial one.

Materials: The proposed alterations would not result in the loss of any historic materials in the district. The proposal to omit the previously approved window system on the front elevation would lead to the retention of a significant amount of the original marble cladding, which is the key character defining feature of the building.

The use of hot rolled metal for the screening wall is substantially more in keeping with the character of the building and the era during which it was constructed than the previously proposed loose rock wall.

Workmanship: The proposed changes would not significantly impact the workmanship of the subject building or any contributing resource in the district.

Feeling: The proposed alterations would not have an impact on the integrity of feeling for the property. The alterations would not increase the impact on the integrity of feeling that is already established by this non-contributing building.

Association: 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 applicable design guidelines for this project are the Harmon Place Historic District Design Guidelines, which were adopted by the Heritage Preservation Commission in September of 2002, and the Design Guidelines for On-Premise Signs and Awnings. (Commissioners can find the Harmon Place Historic District Design Guidelines on pages

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

5.2.1-5.2.18 of their Preservation Resource Binders. The Design Guidelines for On-Premise Signs and Awnings can be found on pages 6.1.1-6.1.7.)

Masonry

The Applicant is proposing to omit a previously approved curtain wall window system on the front (west) elevation. (See Appendix B-40.) Installation of this window system would have required the removal of the original marble cladding on this section of the façade.

Section 1.a. of the Harmon Place Historic District Design Guidelines states: “Decorative masonry features should be retained in repair or renovation projects. Deteriorated brick, stone, mortar, and other materials should be replaced with material used in the original construction or with materials that resemble the appearance of the original as closely as possible.

Eliminating the proposed new window and retaining and maintaining the original marble, the key character defining feature of the building, would be in keeping with this guideline.

Landscape Design

The Harmon Place Historic District Design Guidelines recommend: “9. Landscape Design: a. Landscape features, including shrubs, trees, and berms, should not abut or damage any part of a building or structure. The design of other outdoor improvements, including fences, retaining walls, and canopies, should recognize the past commercial and industrial character of the area and be compatible with the scale and materials of surrounding buildings.”

The proposed wall at the rear corner of the building would be clad in hot-rolled metal. While differing somewhat from its traditional use, metal is a material commonly found on mid-century modern style buildings. The wooden door features a more modern design than the original proposal, and is very similar in design to the previously approved front door. These improvements are in keeping with the design and character of the subject building. While they are not fully in character with the automotive history of the district, neither are they incompatible with the district.

Surface Parking Lots

In relation to the treatment of surface parking lots, the Harmon Place Historic District Design Guidelines state: “a. Surface parking lots should be located to the rear or interior sides of buildings so as to be as unobtrusive as possible. b. Parking lots should be screened with landscaping, low masonry walls, or iron or steel fencing of appropriate design. The past commercial and industrial aesthetic of the area should be recognized. c. Iron or steel fencing should have appropriately scaled and detailed masonry or steel piers. Bollard and chain and other industrial motifs are acceptable.”

The Applicant is proposing to use a wood fence with a rolled metal top to screen the west side of the parking lot. This style of fence was already approved for use on the south side of the parking lot. This style of fence is more appropriate for the property

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

and district than the previously proposed gabion rock wall, which was not approved. The proposed screening wall is in keeping with the design guidelines.

Signs

Three signs have been approved for the project thus far- one on the front wall and two on the front canopy (one on each side.) A fourth sign, over the gate at the rear of the property, was not approved by the HPC through the previous Certificate of Appropriateness application.

Regarding the number of signs, the Design Guidelines for On-Premise Signs state: "Each principal building entrance that faces a public street, or each ground floor principal use, whichever is less, is allowed two signs." The project has already received approval for three signs.

The proposed sign over the gate at the rear of the property is considered a wall sign. It sign measures 11.5" x 140 ", totaling approximately 8.305 square feet, which is below the size limit for wall signs allowed for in the sign guidelines. The proposed sign is in keeping with the scale of the gate and screening wall. It provides building and business identification for the parking lot area. While the project has exceeded the number of signs allowed by the Design Guidelines for On-Premise Signs, the overall amount of signage does not seem inappropriate for the building.

- (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 Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are most applicable to the proposed project.

Standard #3 states:" Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken."

The subject property is a mid-century building, located in a district with a period of significance ending over 25 years before the building was constructed. The proposed alterations are sensitive to the design and era of the subject property.

Standard #5 states: "Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved."

The subject property is relatively plain. The marble cladding on the front of the building is the primary character defining feature. The Applicant's proposal to omit the previously approved window system, which would have removed a large amount of the marble cladding in one bay, is in keeping with this guideline.

- (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." The proposed modifications are sensitive to the style and character of this mid-century modern design of this building, without being overtly inappropriate for the Harmon Place Historic District. The subject property has existed in the district for over a half century and, while not a contributing resource in the district, may have achieved a degree of significance of its own.

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) *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 a document addressing the 12 required findings (see Appendix B-5 – B-11). The Applicant stated that they believe the proposal will not impair the significance or integrity of the historic district.

The Applicant's primary focus when addressing the Harmon Place Historic District designation is the fact that the subject property is non-contributing, and that the proposed alterations are in keeping with the design and character of the subject property. The Applicant does not identify how they believe the proposed alterations are in keeping (or not) with the larger district as a whole.

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

The proposal does not require site plan review as outlined in Title 20, Chapter 530 of the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances.

- (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.***

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

The proposed work falls under the scope of rehabilitation. The Applicant submitted materials addressing all ten of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (see Appendix B-7- B-8). As outlined in finding #5 of this report, staff does find that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards have been addressed.

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 proposed alterations would not be incompatible with the historic district. The building is a non-contributing resource in the district because it was constructed 26 years after the period of significance for the Harmon Place Historic District. The modifications are sensitive and appropriate to this mid-century modern building, which has been in the district for over 50 years, even if it is considered a non-contributing resource to the historic district. The alterations would not have a detrimental impact on the significance or integrity of the Harmon Place Historic District.

(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 proposed are appropriate for the subject property and would not have a negative impact on the surrounding historic properties and district. The alterations are in keeping with the character of the mid-century modern design of the building. The alterations would not have any more of an impact on the essential character of the district than the existing building does.

(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 overall proposal to alter the subject property for conversion to a restaurant use will have a net positive impact on the district. While the original proposal to add windows along Hennepin Avenue was seen as a positive change due to enhanced activity along the street, the retention of a large amount of character defining materials on the building is a positive action for this building. Investment at this property may help spur further investment and improvements on other properties within the district.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

1. CPED-Planning reviews and approves final site plan, floor plans, and elevations.
2. The Applicant shall provide staff with documentation outlining plans for the repair and preservation of the marble façade material.
3. All workmanship must be completed in conformance with the Secretary of Interior Standards, see: <http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/standguide/>
4. The Applicant shall obtain all other necessary City approvals prior to the commencement of work.
5. The Certificate of Appropriateness approvals shall expire if not acted upon within one year of approval, unless extended by the Planning Director in writing prior to the one-year anniversary date of the approvals.

Appendix A: Submitted by CPED staff

Appendix B: Materials submitted by Applicant