Community Planning and Economic Development Department
Planning Division
250 South 4th Street, Room 110
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1385
(612) 673-2597 Phone
(612) 673-2526 Fax
(612) 673-2157 TDD

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2012

TO: Planning Commission and Heritage Preservation Commission- Joint Committee of the Whole Meeting

FROM: Jim Voll, Brian Schaffer, Aaron Hanauer – CPED Planning Division

SUBJECT: Mill and Main Phase II – 401 Main Street Southeast

The Applicant and the Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED) Department seek Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) and City Planning Commission (CPC) feedback on the new construction proposal at 401 Main Street (Mill and Main Phase II). This input will be used by the Applicant as they prepare a formal application. The memo is divided into three sections.

- Description of the proposed building and the site;
- Summarization of the impact previous HPC and CPC approvals will have on the design and siting of the proposed Phase II building;
- Questions in which CPED and the Applicant seek feedback from the HPC and CPC on the proposed design and siting of the building.

Building and Site Description

Siting description: Mill and Main Phase II is located on the site of the Research and Development Annex, also known as Warehouse III, and the Manildra Hydroprocessing Building. Both buildings are non-contributing and were approved for demolition by the HPC on March 20, 2012. The upriver portions of the proposed building footprint are both stepped in slightly to respond to Mid-block and Main Street portions of the Great Northern Rail Spur Corridor.

The proposed project includes interpretation of the rail lines within the Great Northern Rail Spur Corridor to match the treatment proposed by Dominium and approved by HPC and CPC for use on the rest of the Rail Corridor in the Pillsbury A-Mill Complex.

The project also includes street tree plantings along Main Street in a clustered and irregular pattern that matches the direction given to Doran Companies in the HPC's conditions of approval for their Phase I Mill and Main project.

The project includes the completion of the Fourth Avenue connection through the Pillsbury A Mill Complex. It extends between the Red Tile Elevator and the proposed Mill & Main Phase II. The tiered connection includes three interpretive pedestals for the three phases/eras of the Pillsbury A Mill Complex. An accessible ramp runs along the edge of Mill & Main Phase II and is separated from the tiered portion of the pedestrian way by raised planters.

The proposed plans do not include any other landscape or greenscape elements.

Design description: Mill and Main Phase II is similar to Phase I in terms of design, shape, and massing. The proposal is a seven-story, 190-unit building that is 77 feet in height measured from Main Street Southeast. The building is u-shaped with rectangular massing. The lowest two levels are proposed to consist of parking and liner apartments along Main Street Southeast. Floors three through seven contain residential units. Many of the apartment units would have balconies; some partially recessed while others extending completely from the outer wall. The units would have exposed louvers on the outside wall of many individual apartment units. The enclosed parking is accessed along 5th Avenue Southeast and Prince Street.

The Phase II building, like Phase I, is proposed to be broken into five different exterior envelopes. Four of the different exterior treatments are visible along Main Street Southeast.

Envelope 1, located on Main Street Southeast and 5th Avenue Southeast, has a red brick veneer with dark metal panels (A3.2c). The windows and window/door combinations in the outer bays extend the distance of the rough opening. The windows in the middle openings are shorter and flanked by a metal pane on the side and bottom (A3.1c)

Envelope 2 consists of a two-story platform along Main Street that is proposed to have a stone veneer (A3.1c). A terrace is proposed to be located above the platform. Setback behind the terrace 70 feet, the building rises five stories. The five-story portion of the building primarily consists of a vertical metal panel exterior; a small vertical portion is proposed to have dark hardiboard. The metal panel and hardiboard envelope is also seen along the Prince Street elevation.

Envelope 3 consists primarily of buff colored brick; dark metal panels are proposed for horizontal banding on floors one through three and within two of the inner bays. This section is proposed to extend slightly forward compared to the other portions along Main Street Southeast. This building envelope contains two signs: a blade sign that extends from the second to the third floor (approximately 40 square feet) and a sign at the top that reads "M & M". A majority of the rooftop mechanical equipment is located at the top of this section. The buff colored brick and dark metal panel envelope is also seen along Prince Street.

Envelope 4 is proposed to have a grey masonry base on Main Street with the upper floors consisting of horizontally oriented red brick (A3.1c). The horizontally oriented red brick would continue on the upper floors of 4th Avenue and Prince Street; the lower floors of 4th Avenue and

Prince Street are proposed to be constructed with precast concrete panels. The metal panel/insulated precast concrete base would be two stories along 4th Avenue; it would reduce to one story along Prince Street due to the grade change. Windows on floors three through seven are proposed to have eight-lights and be horizontally oriented. The other openings would consist of patio doors flanked by narrow sidelight windows.

Envelope 5 is located on the Prince Street and 5th Avenue Southeast elevations. It primarily consists of a buff colored brick veneer. A dark fiber cement panel is proposed for the top floor and for two bays of windows along both Prince Street and 4th Avenue Southeast (A3.2c).

Zoning description: Mill and Main Phase II is in the following zoning code districts:

- C3A Community Activity Center District
- MR Mississippi River Critical Area Overlay District
- SH Shoreland Overlay District
- UA University Area Overlay District

Based on the most recent information the following applications are proposed:

- Conditional use permit to increase the height from four stories in the C3A District to seven stories.
- Possible Floor Area Ratio (FAR) variance
- Possible setback variance on 5th Avenue SE side
- Site plan review.

Previous Approvals

On December 13, 2011, the HPC approved, with conditions, a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Phase I building at 501 Main Street. The Applicant submitted building permit plans for Phase I, however the building permit set has not received CPED-Planning approval or been issued due to exterior changes not being considered minor alterations. Per 599.370, of the Heritage Preservation ordinance, when changes are not considered minor, an amendment to the Certificate of Appropriateness is required to gain approval from the Heritage Preservation Commission.

CPED-Planning did not consider the following changes in the building permit set of Phase I as minor:

- Increasing the height of exterior masonry on each floor from 2.5 feet to 4 feet;
- Reducing the rough openings of windows and doors from 8 feet to 7 feet;
- Changing fenestration patterns throughout the building including the change of window and door types from a combination of two vertically oriented stationary windows and swing-in door for decks to a single sliding door system;
- Elimination of the rooftop mechanical equipment element that provided varying heights for the building;
- Eliminating the metal clad accent features on windows;
- Changing location/types of exterior materials.

In a conversation with the Applicant, they site structural reasons for the need to make many of these changes.

The following details in the Phase II concept review are similar to what was reviewed and approved by the HPC and CPC:

- Brick portion of the building having a height of 2.5 -3 feet instead of 4 feet;
- Rough opening sizes being 8 feet instead of 7 feet;
- Tall rooftop mechanical equipment that provides varying height for the building
- A combination of two vertically oriented stationary windows and swing-in door for decks

The HPC also approved the treatment of the Rail Spur Corridor through the properties controlled by Doran Companies at the December 13, 2011, meeting. This included the Phase I and Phase II sites. The relevant conditions of approvals were:

1. The current location and alignment of the southernmost rail line of the mid-block portion of the Great Northern Rail Spur Corridor shall be preserved and retained in the proposed interpretation of this rail line.

2. The current location and alignment of the rail line in the Main Street SE portion of the Great Northern Rail Spur Corridor shall be preserved and retained in the proposed interpretation of this rail line.

3. The historic extent of the mid-block portions of the Great Northern Rail Spur Corridor shall be preserved in its entirety. Buildings shall not be located within the rail spur corridor. At 6th Avenue SE the southern edge of the rail spur corridor is 12 feet from the north lot line. At the western extent of the proposed Phase I building the southern edge of the rail spur corridor is 16.4 feet from the north lot line. At the Red Tile Elevator the southern edge of the rail spur corridor is 25 feet from the north lot line.

4. The current extent of the Main Street SE portion of the Great Northern Rail Spur Corridor shall be preserved in its entirety as defined in this report. Buildings shall not be located within the rail spur corridor.

5. The existing rail lines within the Great Northern Rail Spur Corridor shall be salvaged and reinstalled as part of the interpretation of this resource.

6. The trees proposed within the mid-block portion of the Great Northern Rail Spur Corridor are *not* approved.

7. The pattern of proposed street trees within the public rights-of-way shall reflect a volunteer vegetation pattern with clustering and irregular spacing between trees.

8. The paving materials for the site and the Great Northern Rail Spur Corridor as well as the material details for the interpretation of the rail lines within the rail spur corridor are *not* approved.

The Mill & Main Phase II proposal appears to be in keeping with the conditions of the approval for the site and reflects the guidance offered in the conditions and in the public hearing for the treatment of the site. The intent of condition of approval #8 was that the paving materials and

interpretation of the rail lines be coordinated across the entire Pillsbury A Mill Complex no matter that the ownership. The subject proposal reflects this intent.

On March 20, 2012, the Dominium portion of the complex was reviewed by the HPC and received conditioned approvals. Relevant to the site was the Certificate of Appropriateness for the treatment of the Rail Spur Corridor and Site Plan. The relevant conditions of approval were:

1. The Applicant shall submit a coordinated site plan that presents a consistent treatment of the Mid-Block and Main Street SE Rail Spur Corridors and street connections for the entire Pillsbury A Mill Complex. The coordinated site plan shall include addressing lighting, public access, hydrological resources, resource interpretation, and maintenance. The phasing and implementation plan to indicate roles and responsibilities for the coordinated plan and implementation and maintenance of those features. The coordinated and consistent site plan requires review and approval by the HPC in a public hearing prior to any building permit issuance.
2. The Applicant shall submit a Phase I Archaeological Assessment to CPED for review. The plan should also include a process for sensitively excavating archaeology in the site of the Sunken Garden or other areas identified with archaeological potential.
3. The Applicant shall submit and be responsible for implementing a plan to monitor and maintain the stability of the White Concrete Grain Elevators, the Machine Shop, Red Tile Elevator, Pillsbury A Mill, Cleaning House and the South Mill during the demolition and construction phase of the project. The plan shall be submitted to CPED for review and approval.
4. The Applicant shall submit a plan identifying the proposed process and techniques for how the rail lines within the rail spur corridors will be sensitively removed, stored and reused within the proposed project. The plan shall be submitted to CPED for review and approval.
5. The proposed street trees shall not be located in front of any of the historic entrances or loading bays of the Machine Shop, vines on White Grain elevators are not approved.
6. The proposed design for the Warehouse II Courtyard is not approved.

Also on March 20, 2012, the HPC reviewed and conditionally approved the demolition of the Manildra Building (adjacent to Red Tile Elevator). The relevant conditions of approval were:

1. The Applicant shall prepare and submit a detailed plan for the protection and stabilization of the Red Tile Elevator, Warehouse I and the single grain silo located to the east of the Manildra Building during the demolition. The plan should include details on how adjoining building elements will be removed and the Red Tile Elevator and Warehouse I repaired. The plan requires review and approval by the HPC in a public hearing prior to the issuance of any building permits for work on the Manildra Building.
2. Excavation and ground disturbance in the areas identified as areas of “archaeological concern” in the conclusion of the “Report on Phase I Archaeology Assessment of Proposed Mill & Main Development, Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Minnesota” is not approved.
3. The applicant shall submit a coordinated site plan that presents a consistent treatment of the mid-block and Main Street SE rail spur corridors and street connections for the

entire Pillsbury A-Mill complex. The coordinated site plan shall include addressing lighting, public access, and a phasing and implementation plan to indicate roles and responsibilities for the coordinated plan for implementation and maintenance of public access.

Several components of the subject project and the Dominium project rely on satisfying the conditions of approval for the demolition of the Manildra Building. CPED-Planning has presented the following process to Doran, Dominium and the Soap Factory to move the projects forward in a clear review.

> One C of A application from Doran, Dominium and Soap Factory for a coordinated site plan that presents a consistent treatment of the Mid-Block and Main Street SE Rail Spur Corridors and street connections for the entire Pillsbury A Mill Complex. The coordinated site plan shall include addressing lighting, public access, hydrological resources, resource interpretation, and maintenance. The phasing and implementation plan to indicate roles and responsibilities for the coordinated plan and implementation and maintenance of those features.

The City Planning Commission approved Mill and Main Phase I at its meeting on February 6, 2012, with 180 units and 234 bedrooms.

The City Planning Commission approved the Dominium part of the project (A Mill Artist Lofts) at its meeting on April 23, 2012, with 255 units and 337 bedrooms. This approval was appealed by a neighboring property owner. The appeal will be heard at the May 17, 2012, meeting of the Zoning and Planning Committee of the City Council. Staff will provide an update at the joint HPC-CPC Committee of the Whole meeting on May 24, 2012.

Building Design Review

CPED and the Applicant seek the HPC and CPC feedback on the following questions/observations as well as other questions/observations the Commissions may have:

- *Overall building*
    - How does the building design relate to the A Mill Buildings in particular Warehouse I and the Red Tile Elevator?
    - Is the proposed bulk and massing of the Phase II building appropriate for the site and the Saint Anthony Falls Historic District and the Left Bank Milling Subdistrict? A characteristic of this portion of the Saint Anthony Falls Historic District is a varied bulk, massing, and size of the buildings (see aerials). The Phase I building has nearly the same bulk and massing as the proposed Phase II building.
    - Is the exterior material treatment of the building appropriate for the site and the district? The Saint Anthony Falls Historic District guidelines state that the exterior surface of new buildings shall be constructed of brick, stone or concrete.
    - Is the blank first floor wall along the Mid-block portion of the Great Northern Rail Spur Corridor historically appropriate with the historic orientation of the buildings and utilization of the rail corridor?

    - The west, east, and north elevations have blank walls longer the 25 feet that do not meet the requirements of the zoning code.
- *Windows*
    - Is the fenestration pattern overall appropriate for the site and the district? The Saint Anthony Falls Historic District guidelines state that openings should appear in a consistent and repeated pattern across the principal facades. Window openings should be approximately 2-1/2 to 3 times as tall as they are wide.
    - Are the windows in bays 3 and 4 of Envelope 1 along Main Street appropriate for the building?
    - Are the horizontally oriented windows in Envelope 4 appropriate for the building?
    - The east elevation does not meet the window requirements on Levels one and two. The north elevation does not meet the window requirement on Level two.
- *Mechanical equipment*
    - Is the mechanical equipment proposal appropriate for the site and the Saint Anthony Falls Historic district? The rooftop mechanical equipment on top of Envelope 3 is 14 feet in height and breaks up the horizontal plane of the building.
    - Is the proposal for the HVAC equipment with mechanical grills for the individual apartments appropriate for the site and the Saint Anthony Falls Historic District? Some of the individual units are proposed to have the mechanical grills on the exterior surface facing the street; other mechanical grills are recessed within a side balcony wall.
- *Signs*
    - Is the blade sign on Envelope 3 appropriate for the site and the Saint Anthony Falls Historic District (A3.1-A3.2)? The sign is proposed to be 40 square feet and will be 32 feet in height measured from Main Street. It will rise to the top of the third floor. The Heritage Preservation Commission guidelines state that blade (projecting) signs shall not be greater than 12 square feet and not higher than 14 feet in height.
    - Is the 'M&M' sign on Envelope 3 appropriate for the site and the Saint Anthony Falls Historic District? The Heritage Preservation Commission guidelines state that wall signs shall be located between the first and second floor and should not be higher than fourteen (14) feet, except where the historic sign band is higher. Wall signs should also not be more than two (2) feet high and thirty-two (32) square feet in area.

<u>Setting Review</u>

- The project proposal includes the interpretation of the rail located in the Mid-block portion of the Great Northern Rail Spur Corridor. The intent of the guidance offered in the Applicant's previous approvals was to encourage a singular treatment of the corridors and rail lines throughout the complex. The Applicant is proposing a similar treatment, however in Dominium's portion of the project they introduced some

greenspace elements in the rail line interpretation. Should Doran's Phase II be encouraged to include similar treatments to introduce greenspace?