

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development - Planning Division  
**BZH-27210**

**Certificate of Appropriateness**  
BZH-27210

**Date:** February 28, 2012

**Proposal:** Certificate of Appropriateness for window replacement

**Applicant:** Renewal by Anderson (Representative, Bryan Horton, on behalf of the property owners, Natalie and Gilbert Westreich)

**Address of Property:** 1779 Emerson Avenue South

**Project Name:** Pierson Wold House

**Contact Person and Phone:** Bryan Horton, 651-264-4088

**Planning Staff and Phone:** Aaron Hanauer, 612-673-2494

**Date Application Deemed Complete:** February 9, 2012

**Publication Date:** February 21, 2012

**Public Hearing:** February 28, 2012

**Appeal Period Expiration:** March 9, 2012

**Ward:** Ward 7

**Neighborhood Organization:** Lowry Hill

**Concurrent Review:** N/A

**Attachments:** Attachment A: Materials submitted by CPED staff –

- 350' map (A1)
- Incomplete letter (A2-A3)

Attachment B: Materials submitted by Applicant –

- Application (B1-B2)
- Neighborhood and Council Member Notification (B3-B4)
- Project Narrative and Description (B5-B7)
- Statement to Findings (B8-B9)
- Additional Project Information (B10-B12)
- Images (B13-B44)
- Renewal by Anderson Window Information (B45-B58)



**Front Elevation of Property, Source: Bob Glancy, February 2006**

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development - Planning Division  
**BZH-27210**

<b>CLASSIFICATION:</b>	
Local Landmark	Pierson Wold House
Period of Significance	1892-1920
Criteria of significance	Exemplifies broad pattern of development, Persons, and Master Builder
Date of local designation	2008
Applicable Design Guidelines	Secretary of Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties

<b>PROPERTY INFORMATION</b>	
Current name	Natalie and Gilbert Westreich Residence
Historic Name	Pierson Wold House
Current Address	1779 Emerson Avenue South
Historic Address	1779 Emerson Avenue South
Original Construction Date	1892
Original Contractor	T.P. Healy
Original Architect	T.P. Healy
Historic Use	Residential
Current Use	Residential
Proposed Use	Residential

**BACKGROUND:**

The Pierson-Wold house is located at 1779 Emerson Avenue South in the Lowry Hill neighborhood. Designed by renowned Minneapolis builder, Theron Potter (T.P.) Healy, the Colonial Revival style house has a brick veneer and was constructed in 1892.

In 2008, the City Council approved the location designation of the Pierson-Wold House. The current property owners, Natalie and Gilbert Westreich, were in support of the designation and initiated the local designation process.

**WINDOW ANALYSIS:**

The subject building has a total of 56 windows: 8 in the basement, 14 on the first floor, 26 on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, and 8 in the upper story dormers. The Applicant is proposing to replace the 8 windows in the upper story dormers and their accompanying storm windows. The Applicant's representative, Bryan Horton of Renewal by Anderson, indicates that the windows are original to the house and that most of these double hung windows maintain their original rope and pulley system. However, the dormer windows on the front elevation had the rope and pulley system replaced with a vinyl jamb kit in the 1980s (Attachment B10, B13, B27-B30).

The dormer on the side (labeled east on Attachment B14 and B18) and rear elevations have windows with true-divided lights in a horizontally diamond lattice pattern. The rear elevation dormer windows are wider than those on the front and side elevations, but the lattice details are the same (Attachment B15).

Per CPED's request, Renewal by Anderson completed a window assessment. Mr. Horton determined that the dormer windows are in fair to good condition (Attachment A2-A3 and B10-B11). Mr. Horton does point out issues with the existing windows including (Attachment B10):

- Some of the windows do not operate due to the age of the rope and pulley system;
- The locks and hardware are no longer operational and are permanently locked in place;
- The 3<sup>rd</sup> level exterior storm windows are broken or in disrepair.

CPED also requested that Mr. Horton submit a rehabilitation analysis of the windows proposed to be replaced, however, this was not provided as part of the application (Attachment A2).

**SUMMARY OF APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL:**

The Applicant is proposing to replace the eight double hung windows on the top floor and their accompanying storm windows (Attachment B11-B17). The Applicant's representative states that the homeowner looked into getting them repaired but was unable to find a company willing to repair them instead of replacing them entirely (Attachment B10). The homeowners' main concern with the windows is the amount of energy lost through the broken storms and drafty wood-on-wood sash and frame (Attachment B10).

The proposed replacement windows would be built to match (to within 1/16" of an inch) the existing window dimensions (Attachment B2). The proposed replacement windows are made of Fibrex which is a composite of wood fibers and a special thermoplastic polymer (Attachment B45).

Renewal by Anderson proposes to use their *Insert Instillation* method. This involves removing the existing window sashes and operating mechanisms, and to insert the new window frame within the existing frame. Renewal by Anderson estimates that the overall glass space will be decreased by no more than a ½ inch on each side of the window. The *Insert Installation* method allows for all exterior and interior historic trim to remain the same (Attachment B5). The replacement windows are proposed to have an eggshell type finish eliminating any shiny or reflective exterior (Attachment B8).

The Applicant's replacement proposal for the four windows that have a true-divided light lattice pattern is a simulated divided light diamond lattice pattern to match the existing (labeled east on Attachment B14 and B18-B19, and B22-B24). This will be done with a permanently applied grille on the outer surfaces of the upper sash. Renewal by Anderson states that, "Due to manufacturing constraints we are unable to have an interstitial spacer (Attachment B10). Mr. Horton adds, "Due to the windows being on the 3<sup>rd</sup> level, we feel, any spacer between the panes will not be seen (Attachment B10)."

Future projects have been discussed for the other windows of the house, but "at this point the homeowner is only interested in replacing the third floor windows and has no plans to replace the other 48 windows and 3 doors in the dwelling (Attachment B10)."

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

As of February 21, 2012, no public comments were received.

**CETIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:** Certificate of Appropriateness for window replacement.

***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.***

Regardless of what changes are made to the subject property, it will retain its historical significance, but proposed changes may affect its integrity (i.e. the property's ability to communicate its historical significance), as discussed in finding #3 below.

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

The exterior portions of the building contribute to the landmark designation. The Pierson Wold House is significant for its association with a master builder, Theron Potter (T.P.) Healy. The proposal to remove historic wood windows in repairable condition does not support the property's exterior designation

**(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 removing historic materials that are in repairable condition, thereby marring the property's integrity of 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 Heritage Preservation Commission has not adopted local design guidelines for the 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 retrofitting or replacing windows when they are able to be repaired. The eight proposed windows for replacement are original. Pictorial evidence shows some of the windows need repair work; however, the Applicant provides a window condition assessment that states the windows are in fair to good condition (Attachment B11).

*The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Illustrated Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* (which replaced the Energy Conservation chapter of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation & Illustrated Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Building*) do not recommend removing repairable historic windows and replacing them with new windows for perceived improvement in energy performance. The Applicant has stated that the primary reason for replacing the windows is a desire for improved energy efficiency, yet the Applicant has

submitted no evidence of tests assessing the energy efficiency of the existing historic windows and their accompanying storm windows.

In addition, the rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* do not recommend changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of the glazing; or the appearance of the frame. The window frames are proposed to be made of Fibrex, a composite of wood fibers and a special thermoplastic polymer (Attachment B45). This material was not available during the period of significance. In addition, the proposed windows and chosen installation method would reduce the glazing by a ½ inch on each side of the window. This is a relatively small difference compared to the existing windows. However, given that the other original windows are proposed to remain, the difference will likely be discernable.

Four of the double hung windows that are proposed to be replaced contain a true-divided light diamond lattice. The proposed replacement windows contain a simulated divided light diamond lattice pattern with an applied grille on the outer surfaces of the windows. The visibility of the proposed windows with the diamond lattice would be minimal from the public street with current conditions, however, if the current trees near the home were removed, the windows would be highly visible. In addition, when viewed from close range, the use of an applied grille on the outer surfaces of the windows without an interstitial spacer would have a substantially different appearance compared to the existing windows with a true divided light window or a replacement window with the interstitial spacer.

- (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 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 1-4 (Attachment B8-B9).

- (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.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The CPED-Planning Division recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission **adopt** staff findings and **deny** the Certificate of Appropriateness for window replacement.

**Attachment A:** Submitted by CPED staff

**Attachment B: Materials submitted by Applicant**

**Attachment C: Materials submitted by Others**