

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

Certificate of Appropriateness
BZH-27054

Proposal: Front porch alterations and a side entry stair replacement

Applicant: William Lockett, 612-242-0963

Address of Property: 3045 5th Ave S

Planning Staff: John Smoley, Ph.D., 612-673-2830

**Date Application
Deemed Complete:** n/a

Public Hearing: January 17, 2012

Appeal Period Expiration: January 27, 2012

Ward: 8

Neighborhood Organization: Central Area Neighborhood Development Organization

Concurrent Review: n/a

Attachments:

- Staff Report – A1-A10
- Materials Submitted by CPED – B1
 - 350' radius zoning map – B1
- Materials Submitted by Applicant – C1-C20
 - Application and Supporting Materials - C1-C20
- Materials Submitted by Other Parties – n/a

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division



3045 5th Ave S, 2011, before porch work, photo submitted by Applicant

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division



3045 5th Ave S, 2011, current appearance, photo submitted by Applicant

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

District/Area information	
Historic District	N/A
Neighborhood	Central Neighborhood

Historic Property information	
Current name	3045/47 5 th Avenue South
Historic Name	Frank & Laura Chase Residence
Current Address	3045 5 th Avenue South
Historic Address	3045/3047 5 th Avenue South
Original Construction Date	1904
Original Contractor	M. Schumacher
Original Architect	William M Kenyon
Historic Use	Residence
Current Use	Residence
Proposed Use	Residence
Other Historical Designations	N/A

BACKGROUND:

On October 11, 2011 the Heritage Preservation Commission approved the City Council's nomination of the property as a Landmark, established interim protection, and directed the Planning Director to prepare or cause to be prepared a designation study. That study is in progress.

The residence was built for Frank R. and Laura B. Chase. It is located at the northeast corner of 5th Avenue South and 31st Street East. The house was designed by William M. Kenyon and constructed by M. Schumacher for the price of \$8000 in 1904. The building is a 2.5 story split gable design in the Shingle Style. It has shake siding on the upper stories and lap siding on the ground level. The building has a front porch with brick columns. This porch was added to the home in 1914, during the time Frank and Laura Chase owned in the building. In 1995 window glass and screens on the home were repaired. In 2009 and 2011 windows were replaced on the home.

SUMMARY OF APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL:

The Applicant wishes to replace a (north) side entry stair and convert the existing front porch to habitable space. The scope of work includes:

1. removing existing nonhistoric porch windows and replacing them with siding and smaller windows;
2. installing windows between existing framing in the porch's gable;

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

3. removing a window in the main building wall behind the porch and replacing it with siding to match the siding currently on the building;
4. removing and replacing a nonhistoric door and door trim that lead into the main building from the porch;
5. removing the inner half of historic brick porch piers that flank the porch stairway;
6. removing the existing nonhistoric porch door and replacing it with a new nonhistoric door; and
7. partitioning and insulating the space inside the porch to create two rooms and an entry hallway into the main building;

The Applicant began work on the proposed project without a building permit and was cited for conducting unpermitted work, prior to the establishment of interim protection.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Staff has received no public comment on the 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 property has not yet been designated, but remains under interim protection.

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

The property has not yet been designated, but remains under interim protection.

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

The proposed work will impair the integrity of the property by inappropriately altering the historic design and materials of the front porch, thereby marring the property's integrity of design and materials.

(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 Commission has not adopted design guidelines for the subject 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.

The Applicant is conducting a rehabilitation of the subject property. The proposed project does not follow the rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* do not recommend enclosing porches in a manner that results in a diminution or loss of historic character by using materials such as wood, stucco, or masonry.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

The proposal will result in the conversion of the subject porch from a naturally climate-controlled social space and entryway into habitable space. Siding used on the porch is proposed to match the siding used on the rest of the building, but no dimensions of existing or proposed siding have been supplied to verify this assertion (Attachment C5, C6).

The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* recommend designing enclosures for historic porches on secondary elevations 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. The porch is on a primary building elevation and the proposal includes the construction of walls in places where the porch remained open historically (Attachment C5).

The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* do not recommend changing the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows, through cutting new openings, blocking-in windows, and installing replacement sashes that do not fit the historic window opening. The Applicant is proposing to remove a window in the main building wall behind the porch and inappropriately block the opening in (Attachment C6, numbered note 3).

The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* do not recommend stripping entrances and porches of historic material such as wood, cast iron, terra cotta tile, and brick. The Applicant is proposing to inappropriately remove the inner half of historic brick porch piers that flank the porch stairway (Attachment C6, numbered note 2).

(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.*

Action 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 project will modify the building in ways that are insensitive to its historical character, as discussed in finding 5 above.

Comprehensive plan policy 8.1 states that the City will, "Preserve, maintain, and designate districts, landmarks, and historic resources which serve as reminders of the city's architecture, history, and culture." The proposed work will damage this building's ability to communicate its historical significance, as discussed in item 3 above.

(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*

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

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 involve the destruction of the 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 included a statement describing how the project meets findings 1-6 (Attachment C3).

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

The proposal does not trigger Site Plan Review required by Zoning Code Chapter 530.

(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.*

As discussed in finding #5, the application is not in compliance with the rehabilitation guidelines of *the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

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:

(11) *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 property does not lie within a historic district.

(12) *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 property does not lie within a historic district.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

(13) 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 property does not lie within a historic district. The request might set a precedent for future cases, but will not authorize changes to other Landmarks, Historic Districts, or properties under interim protection without staff or HPC review.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Planning Division

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

CPED-Planning recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission **adopt** staff findings and **deny** the Certificate of Appropriateness.