Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

Certificate of Appropriateness
BZH-27027

Date:	November 7, 2011
Proposal:	Certificate of Appropriateness for building and site alterations.
Applicant:	Design for Preservation, Robert Roscoe
Address of Property:	31-51 West Island Avenue
Project Name:	West Island Condominiums Roof and Landscape Alterations
Contact Person and Phone:	Robert Roscoe, 612-317-0989
Planning Staff and Phone:	Chris Vrchota, 612-673-5467
Date Application Deemed Complete:	October 17, 2011
Publication Date:	October 31, 2011
Public Hearing:	November 7, 2011
Appeal Period Expiration:	November 17, 2011
Ward:	Ward 3
Neighborhood Organization:	Nicollet Island- East Bank Neighborhood Association
Concurrent Review:	N/A
Attachments:	Attachment A: Materials submitted by CPED staff – • 350' map (A-1) Attachment B: Materials submitted by Applicant – • Notification letters to Council Member and neighborhood organization (B-1- B-2) • Application form (B-3 – B-4) • Project Description and Findings (B-5 – B-8) • Plans, Elevations and Details (B-9 – B-20) • Photos (B-21 – B-24)

Subject Property- Present Day- Photo provided by Applicant

CLASSIFICATION:	
Local Historic District	St. Anthony Falls
Period of Significance	1858- 1940
Criteria of significance	Architecture, Commerce/Industry
Date of local designation	1971
Applicable Design Guidelines	St. Anthony Falls Historic District Guidelines, Secretary of Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties

PROPERTY INFORMATION	
Current name	West Island Condominiums
Historic Name	N/A
Current Address	41-45 West Island Avenue
Historic Address	N/A
Original Construction Date	1983
Original Contractor	Nicollet Restoration
Original Architect	Brooks Cavin (Per the Applicant)
Historic Use	N/A
Current Use	Residential
Proposed Use	Residential

BACKGROUND:
The subject property is a modern, multi-family residential structure constructed in 1984, containing 12 condominium units. The structure, which is non-contributing to the St. Anthony Falls Historic District, is three stories tall. It is clad in Hardi-board siding, which was installed in 2004, and is capped with a mansard-style roof which is covered with wood shakes.

SUMMARY OF APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL:
The Applicant is proposing to remove the mansard parapet roof at the top of the building and over the two front entries. The roofline of the main building would have a new, flat parapet with simple decorative brackets added. The roofs over the front entry canopies would also be reconstructed as nearly-flat roofs. The entry canopies would be given additional support columns, and the roofs would have brackets matching those on the new parapet added. The Applicant is also proposing to make alterations to the paving and landscaping area in front of the building, between the building wall and the public sidewalk.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comments had been received at the time of publication.

<u>CETIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS</u>: Certificate of Appropriateness for installation of rooftop deck and rooftop mechanical room expansion.

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 proposed alterations would be compatible with and continue to support the criteria and period of significance for which the historic district was designated. The St. Anthony Falls Historic District is significant for its connection to the Mississippi River and St. Anthony Falls area, as well as the milling industry that grew up around the river and falls. The district contains a number of mill and warehouse buildings, as well as early residential structures.

The site, which is a modern residential structure, is a non-contributing resource in the district. Because the subject site is a non-contributing resource in the district, concerns about the potential impacts of the proposed work are focused on how it would impact the adjacent buildings and the district as a whole, rather than how it impacts the subject site.

The Applicant is proposing to replace the mansard style roof with a flat roof and parapet wall. This form is compatible with the period of significance for the district, and is in keeping with the area.

None of the proposed alterations would have an impact on the criteria or period of significance for the St. Anthony Falls Historic District.

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

The St. Anthony Falls Historic District was designated for its representation of the milling industry and related architectural forms along the riverfront. The subject site is a modern residential structure, constructed with the approval of the Heritage Preservation Commission in 1983. The alterations would have minimal visual impact on the structure. The proposed new roof forms for both the main roofline and the front entry canopies are compatible with forms that would have been found and used in the district during the period of significance. The improvements would be compatible with and support the exterior designation for the St. Anthony Falls Historic District.

(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 negatively impact any of these aspects.

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

Design: The change in the form of the roofs would alter the design of the building. However, the design is appropriate for the period of significance for the district, and the change would not impact the integrity of design.

Setting: The Applicant is not proposing any off-site changes or any on-site changes that would impact the way the structure relates to its neighbors. The proposed changes to the landscaping would have limited visibility from adjacent properties. The change to the rooflines on the building, while visible, would not have a detrimental impact on the integrity of setting, as the new roof forms would still be appropriate for the district.

Materials: The Applicant is proposing to install new courses of Hardi-board siding on the portion of the wall that would be exposed through the removal of the mansard roof. This would match the existing Hardi-board, which was installed in 2004. The parapet would be faced with Hardi-panels as well, while the new decorative brackets would be wood. The proposed alterations would use materials already existing on the building and would not impact the integrity of materials.

Workmanship: The proposed work would not have an impact on the design or workmanship of any contributing resource in the district. The overall impact on the existing building would be small. The proposed alterations would add more decorative elements to the building and the district through the simple brackets on the rooflines. The proposed work would impact the contributing resource's integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: The subject site is a modern building designed and constructed for residential use. The proposed work would maintain the site's use as a residential property without having an impact on any adjacent contributing sites. The project would not impair the property's integrity of feeling or the integrity of feeling for the district.

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 St. Anthony Falls Historic District Design Guidelines, which were adopted by the Heritage Preservation Commission in June of 1980. (Commissioners can find the Guidelines on pages 5.6.1-5.6.10 of their Preservation Resource Binders.)

The St. Anthony Falls Historic District Design Guidelines deal almost exclusively with infill construction and provide little guidance for alterations to existing buildings, either historic or modern. The site falls within subsection F, the "Nicollet Island (Masonry)" section of the design guidelines.

Regarding materials, the guidelines for subsection F state: "New buildings shall be constructed of brick or limestone." The exterior of the building was originally clad in wood siding, which was replaced with Hardi-board siding with an identical reveal in 2004. The Applicant is proposing to use a combination of wood and Hardi-board for the new features on the building. While not in keeping with the Guidelines, the use of material matching that already on the building is appropriate and will not impair the significance or integrity of the district.

In regard to roof shapes, the subsection states: "New roofs should be flat or nearly flat. Mansard roofs similar to the Grove Street Flats should be considered on a case-by-case basis." The mansard roof on this building was likely approved based on the second portion of the guideline. The switch to a flat roof with a parapet would be in keeping with this guideline.

(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 #9 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 subject building was approved by the Heritage Preservation Commission in 1983. It is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the historic district. The proposed flat roof with a parapet wall and flat roofs over the front entries, along with the proposed bracket additions, are compatible with the architectural features of the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. The proposed work is in keeping with this standard.

(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 proposed, the project would conform to policy 8.1.1 of The Minneapolis Plan, which states: "Protect historic resources from modifications that are not sensitive to their historic significance." The subject site is a modern, non-contributing resource in the historic district. The proposed work is designed in a manner that is compatible with the design of the contributing resources within the district. It will not have an impact on the significance of any contributing property or the district as a whole.

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 material addressing some of the findings required for a Certificate of Appropriateness. (See Appendix B-8.) The Applicant stated that the alterations would "change the existing non-conforming architectural elements to features more in keeping with the general architectural character of Nicollet Island." The proposed alterations demonstrate that the Applicant has given consideration to the traditional building forms found on Nicollet Island and within the district.

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

The proposed work 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.

The Applicant submitted a statement addressing the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. (See Appendix B-7). The Applicant stated that the project is in keeping with each of the standards, but did not go into specific detail. As outlined in finding #5 of this report, staff finds that the proposed work is in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

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 St. Anthony Falls Historic District is significant for its connection to the Mississippi River and St. Anthony Falls area, as well as the milling industry that grew up around the river and falls. The subject property is a modern residential structure built in 1983, with the approval of the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission. The proposed changes would not altar the design of the building in a significant manner, and would be compatible with the character of the district. The proposed work would not have an impact on any contributing resource in the district. The alterations would be compatible with and ensure the continued significance and integrity of all contributing properties in the 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 Applicant is proposing to make sensitive alterations to the landscaping and building, which is a modern, non-contributing building in the historic district. These alterations would not have an impact on the significance or integrity of the district. The changes would be in keeping with the spirit and intent of the ordinance and would not negatively alter the essential character of the St. Anthony Falls 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 meets all applicable standards and guidelines and is sensitive to the subject property and the district. The subject site is non-contributing to the district, and the proposed alterations are sensitive to the period of significance and historic design for the district. The certificate of appropriateness would not be injurious to the significance and integrity of contributing resources in the historic district and would not impede the normal and orderly preservation of surrounding resources as allowed by regulations in the preservation ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

CPED-Planning staff recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission **adopt** staff findings and **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness for building and site alterations on the subject site, with the following conditions:

1. CPED-Planning shall review and approves final site plan, floor plans, and elevations.
2. All workmanship must be completed in conformance with the Secretary of Interior Standards, see: *http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/standguide/*
3. The Applicant shall obtain all other necessary City approvals prior to the commencement of work.
4. 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.

Attachment A: Submitted by CPED staff

Attachment B: Materials submitted by Applicant