

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development

Certificate of Appropriateness
BZH-27590

Proposal: Office building rehabilitation and plaza construction

Applicant: Hess, Roise and Company

Address of Property: 1215 and 1219 Marshall Street Northeast

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

Date Application Deemed Complete: December 10, 2012

Public Hearing: January 15, 2013

Appeal Period Expiration: January 25, 2013

Ward: 3

Neighborhood Organization: Sheridan Neighborhood Organization

Concurrent Review:

1. The applicant is in the process of purchasing these properties from the city, pursuant to a 2011 request for proposals to reuse both sites.
2. The applicant has concurrently submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct two four-story multi-family residential buildings at 1219 Marshall Street Northeast, just east of the proposed plaza location.
3. The new construction proposal will require land use approvals from the City Planning Commission and City Council including:
 - a. a petition to rezone the site from C1 Neighborhood Commercial District and R5 Multiple-family District to OR2 High Density Office Residence District;
 - b. a conditional use permit to allow a planned unit development (PUD), including allowing alternatives for more than one principal structure on a zoning lot, to the front yard requirement adjacent to Main Street Northeast for a building and a parking area, to the front yard requirement adjacent to Marshall St NE for the plaza and to the corner side yard requirement adjacent to 13th Ave NE for the plaza;
 - c. a variance of the parking location requirements to allow a parking area to be located between the building and the front lot lines adjacent to Main Street Northeast and Marshall Street Northeast in an office residence district;
 - d. a variance to reduce the rear yard requirement from 11 feet to 9 feet to allow a building and from 10 feet to 9 feet to allow balconies;
 - e. site plan review;
 - f. plat; and

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27590

- g. administrative review of the plaza standards, to include possible art feature installation, which would have to be reviewed pursuant to the Heritage Preservation Regulations sometime in the future.
- 4. Due to the project's use of federal funds (a Housing and Urban Development loan), the plaza construction is subject to a review pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, currently in progress.
- 5. The applicant has applied for state and federal historic preservation tax credits for the office building rehabilitation. This review is currently in progress.

Attachments:

- o Staff Report (A)
- o Materials Submitted by CPED (B)
 - o Zoning district map
 - o Aerial photograph of site and landmark
 - o Site and building photographs
 - o Archaeology studies
- o Materials Submitted by Applicant (C)
 - o Project description, photographs, and scope of work
 - o Statement addressing the applicable Certificate of Appropriateness findings
 - o Plans and Specification Sheets
- o Materials Submitted by Other Parties (D) – n/a

CLASSIFICATION:	
Landmark Name	Minneapolis Brewing and Malting Company (AKA Grain Belt Brewery)
Period of Significance	1891-1927
Criteria of Significance	Architecture, Events
Date of Local Designation	1977
Date of Listing in the National Register of Historic Places	1990
Applicable Design Guidelines	Amended <i>Grain Belt Brewery Area Development Objectives</i> (2000) <i>The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i>

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27590

PROPERTY INFORMATION	
Current name	Grain Belt Marshall Street Site
Historic Name	Minneapolis Brewing and Malting Company Office Building and Orth Brewery Site
Current Address	1215 Marshall Street Northeast (office building) and 1219 Marshall Street Northeast (Orth Brewery Site, AKA 130 13 th Avenue Northeast)
Historic Address	1215 & 1219 Marshall Street Northeast
Original Construction Date	1893
Original Contractor	Trainor Brothers
Addition Contractor	R.J. Chiney and Company
Original Architect	Carl Struck
Addition Architect	Boehme and Cordella
Historic Use	Office building and brewery site
Current Use	Vacant
Proposed Use	Office building and multi-family residence

BACKGROUND:

The proposal encompasses two lots. The Grain Belt office building stands at 1215 Marshall Street Northeast. Archaeological remnants of Minneapolis' first brewery and Minnesota's second brewery, the Orth Brewery, lie below the surface of 1219 Marshall Street Northeast (AKA 130 13th Avenue Northeast).

French immigrant John Orth opened Minnesota's second brewery on this site in 1850, two years after Anthony Yoerg established the state's first brewery in St. Paul. Orth continued in this business until his death in 1887 at which time his sons, long involved in the company, took over. The Minneapolis Brewing and Malting Company officially began in 1890 with the merger of Orth's brewery with three other long-standing local breweries: Germania Brewing, Heinrich Brewing, and Norenburg Brewing. The companies consolidated to be more competitive in a market increasingly being taken over by international investors. An initial rush of construction begun in 1891 resulted in a major brewery complex just north of Broadway Street Northeast on the east bank of the Mississippi River.

Production began in July 1892. The new complex was capable of producing three hundred thousand barrels of beer each year. In addition to the extant brew house, power station, and wagon shed, the company built the two-story rectangular office building in 1893. Cream-colored Milwaukee brick cladding, a course of rough-faced Platteville (Wisconsin) limestone foundation, and Mankato dolomite window trim and beltcourses link the building to the Richardsonian Romanesque style of architecture.

The fledgling corporate giant thrived, producing half a million barrels of beer in 1900. By 1910 the company's success prompted a second wave of development which included a one and one-half story, eighty-five foot-long addition to the office building, constructed in 1912. Although the architect used identical primary exterior building materials, the addition is

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27590

distinguished from the original construction by a gabled roof, as opposed to the slightly sloped, parapeted flat roof on the original building. A one-story flat-roofed connector further distinguishes the original construction from the later addition.

The connector and main addition possess the building's most ornate features: two stained glass lay lights. Unfortunately, both the connector's flat lay light and the main addition's barrel-vaulted companion are no longer naturally lit. Both of the skylights that once protected the lay lights have been covered in composition roofing. In the case of the connector, both the skylight frame and glazing were removed, while the main addition's skylight glass has been removed but its steel frame endures.

The brewery had its ups and downs, surviving war-rationing, prohibition, labor unrest, and major competition from local and national brands. In 1967 the company officially changed its name to Grain Belt Breweries, Inc. It possessed 30% of the Minnesota beer market and was roughly the twentieth largest brewer in the nation. Within a decade the brewery's fortunes changed dramatically. In 1975 Irwin Jacobs purchased Grain Belt, promising to continue brewery operations. He owned the Northwestern Bag Co but had no experience brewing. Within eight months he'd sold the company to the Heileman Brewing Company of La Crosse, which had just bought St. Paul's Schmidt Brewery. The last batch of beer rolled off the production line on Christmas Day 1975. Shortly after, Jacobs applied for wrecking permits to demolish the brewery complex and redevelop the riverfront site. The City denied the application and designated the complex as a landmark in 1977. After years of neglect, the City purchased the property in 1989. It was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1990.

Since then the City has worked with local developers and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to secure capital, rehabilitate, and reinvigorate portions of the main brewery complex, which now includes architectural offices, Park Board facilities, a public library branch, a union office, and artist studios. Restoration of five of the six larger structures garnered preservation awards from the National Trust for Historic Preservation (2005), the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota (2002), the Minnesota Chapter of the American Institute of Architects (2002), the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission (2002), the Minnesota Real Estate Journal (2001) and others.

The office building and adjacent Orth Brewery site are the last portion of the complex owned by the City and in need of redevelopment. A recent request for proposals for redevelopment of the sites has resulted in a fully-executed Contract for Sale and Redevelopment of Property between the City and Orth-Grain Belt LLC dated November 28, 2012, regarding the Grain Belt office building, and work is currently in progress on a similar agreement regarding the adjacent housing site at 1219 Marshall Street Northeast. Everwood Development, LLC has retained the applicant, Hess, Roise, and Company, as their historical consultant. Closing on the properties is anticipated between May and July 2013.

The proposal is subject to both Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) and SHPO review. Since both lots lie within the landmark boundaries of the Minneapolis Brewing and Malting Company, the HPC will review alterations to the property. The City recently received two Legacy Amendment grants to abate water infiltration in the office building. These grants

require the owner to maintain the property in a satisfactory manner, to include complying with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* for twenty years from the date of receiving the grants (completed in summer 2011), as determined by SHPO. The applicant is seeking federal and state historic preservation tax credits to rehabilitate the office building, so SHPO will review proposed alterations in this capacity as well. The applicant has also applied for federal funding for the proposed multi-family development, thus changes to the Orth Brewery site are being reviewed by the SHPO for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

A rezoning, a conditional use permit, variances, a site plan review, a plat, and an administrative review of the plaza standards will be required for the project. Planning staff, the City Planning Commission, and the City Council will review these applications, submitted on December 10, 2012.

On June 5, 2012, the applicant brought their proposal to the Heritage Preservation Commission for a conceptual review.

SUMMARY OF APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL:

The Applicant wishes to:

1. rehabilitate the office building; and
2. construct a plaza atop the subsurface remnants of the Orth Brewery.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Staff has received no public comment on the project.

Findings as required by the Minneapolis Preservation Code:

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 maintain 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 of the building communicates its historical significance. While historic features

and materials do exist on the interior of the building, the majority of the building's historic features, and all of its character defining-features, are on its exterior, including previously covered skylight/day light systems and windows. The vast majority of the applicant's proposal involves the preservation, repair, and (in a few cases) in-kind replacement of historic features. The applicant proposes to continue the building's original function as an office building, with some portions minimally changed for use by occupants of the adjacent multi-family development. The most notable change designed for the use of those residents is the proposed addition of a steel deck to the rear of the addition on its northern side. The most notable change to restore the building's historic appearance is the restoration of one skylight/day light system at the rear of the building. Other significant changes include the proposed removal of door and window openings on the basement level's north side. While this latter proposal is clearly not in-line with standard preservation practice, its intent is to combat water infiltration, a long-standing problem for the building and one which has reduced its value tremendously.

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

The Applicant's proposed preservation and repair of the majority of the building's historic materials; in-kind replacement of deteriorated historic materials; water infiltration abatement efforts; and skylight/day light system restoration will help ensure the property's longevity and not impair the building's integrity of design.

(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.

Alterations to this landmark are subject to the amended *Grain Belt Brewery Area Development Objectives*. Section C (Marshall Street Northeast and other Streetscape Improvements) of this document states,

Improvements to Marshall Street are expected that will redesign this heavily-used thoroughfare into a boulevard with a streetscape that will be "greener, less cluttered, and safer". The development of this streetscape may include the installation of a new lighting system with historic design and the creation of a plaza on the east side of Marshall Street opposite the Brewhouse is also proposed that will be called Brewery Square. This will be a European-style plaza that will be part of the private development that takes place on this block but would be publicly-accessible to permit the viewing of the facade of the Brewhouse. It is also a goal to encourage the development of streetscape improvements on 13th and 14th Avenues Northeast between Marshall Street and the river to make these streets attractive gateways with landscaping and infrastructure to

promote pedestrian and bicycle movement from the neighborhood to the riverfront.

Since the conceptual review on June 5, 2012, the applicant has revised their plaza plans to be in line with staff's recommendations and the HPC's guidance. In lieu of a sunken plaza, the applicant is proposing a plaza designed to encapsulate the archaeological remnants of the Orth Brewery. Rather than digging down, fill, sod, and pavers will be placed atop a heavy duty pond liner and 4" drain tile designed to protect the remnants (plan sheet C1-C5). Proposed deciduous tree plantings have been moved outside of the area of significant archaeological features (plan sheet L1-L2). With archaeological resources only 16-36" below ground, these changes are highly appropriate.

Neither the Development Objectives nor the applicant's proposal define their vision of a European plaza, but well-known plazas like Venice's Piazza di San Marco and Munich's Marienplatz don't rely upon grade changes or even landscaping to capture interest. They do, however, provide active commercial spaces at the plaza edges and provide interesting buildings that offer views of the plaza. While the multi-family development proposed to border the plaza to the north won't feature commercial spaces, the applicant has added windows, balconies, and architectural features to what was previously a blank wall that concealed a parking garage. The addition of these architectural elements designed to break up the plane of the wall and provide active viewing of the plaza area will improve perceptions of safety onsite and provide visual interest. Proposed freestanding signs designed to interpret the site's history will provide an added attraction to draw in visitors and hopefully foster pride in the neighborhood's heritage (plan sheet L1-L2).

(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. As conditioned, the proposed project follows the rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

The application consists of two major parts:

1. rehabilitate the office building; and
2. construct a plaza atop the subsurface remnants of the Orth Brewery.

Part I. Rehabilitate the office building (as depicted in all plan sheets, with specific plan sheets and photographs indicated in the applicant's scope of work)

Scope of Work Item #1 - Brick, cleaning and repair (and gutter replacement)

The applicant proposes to clean the brick walls with Prosoco Heavy Duty Restoration Cleaner on the south, north, and west walls. On the east wall Prosoco Fast Acting Paint Stripper will be used to remove paint from a historically unpainted wall. The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* recommend

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27590

cleaning masonry only when necessary to halt deterioration or remove heavy soiling. Furthermore, the guidelines recommend cleaning masonry surfaces with the gentlest method possible, such as low pressure water and detergents, using natural bristle brushes. Apart from the nonhistoric paint on the east wall, the applicant has not submitted evidence that heavy soiling exists, nor have they submitted evidence that masonry cleaning cannot be accomplished with low pressure water and brushed-on detergents. Staff recommends the project be conditioned to not permit the proposed masonry cleaning beyond the proposed paint removal.

The applicant also proposes to conduct the following work, in line with the rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*:

- a. repainting existing signs on the east and west walls with colors that reference the red, gold, and white colors of the Grain Belt Beer label;
- b. removing conduit, chains, nonhistoric lights, nonhistoric vents, and other obsolete metallic features on the exterior of the building;
- c. repointing deteriorated mortar joints, with proposed mortar and joints to match the color, size, texture, tooling, and strength of the historic mortar and joints on the building; and
- d. replacing crumbling brick in-kind.

The applicant has offered to submit test panels of the replacement brick and mortar to staff for review. Staff recommends that the project be conditioned to require such review prior to the issuance of building permits for the repointing and brick replacement.

The applicant has also requested permission to replace the nonhistoric gutters and downspouts on the building with new metal gutters and downspouts on the building painted a cream color to match the brick, but the city recently received state Legacy Amendment funds to replace most of the gutters and downspouts on the building. The city continues to use local funds to install new downspouts in an effort to better shed water from the building's roof and prevent water infiltration. Staff recommends the project be conditioned to permit the proposed replacement of gutters and downspouts in areas that have not been subject to such treatment within the last three years.

Scope of Work Item #2 - Stone, cleaning and repair

The applicant proposes to clean the stone wall components with Prosoco Heavy Duty Restoration Cleaner on the south, north, and west walls. On the east wall Prosoco Fast Acting Paint Stripper will be used to remove paint from a historically unpainted wall. The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* recommend cleaning masonry only when necessary to halt deterioration or remove heavy soiling. Furthermore, the guidelines recommend cleaning masonry surfaces with the gentlest method possible, such as low pressure water and detergents, using natural bristle brushes. Apart from the nonhistoric paint on the east wall, the applicant has not submitted evidence that heavy soiling exists, nor have they submitted evidence that masonry cleaning cannot be accomplished with low pressure water and brushed-on detergents. Staff recommends the project be conditioned to not permit the proposed masonry cleaning beyond the proposed paint removal.

The applicant also proposes to conduct the following work, in line with the rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*:

- a. resetting shifting stone on the west wall;
- b. repairing cracked stone pieces with two-part polyester or epoxy-resin stone adhesive injected into the cracks and/or stone patching compound made by Cathedral Stone Products or Jahn Restoration Mortars;
- c. replacing portico baluster chains and strapping with less visually intrusive stainless steel pins;
- d. replacing irreparable broken stone baluster pieces in-kind; and
- e. repointing limestone knee walls and planters.

The applicant has offered to submit test panels of the replacement stone and mortar to staff for review. Staff recommends that the project be conditioned to require such review prior to the issuance of building permits for the repointing and stone replacement. Staff also recommends that the project be conditioned to ensure the proposed limestone knee wall and planter mortar and joints match the color, size, texture, tooling, and strength of the historic mortar and joints on the building.

Scope of Work Item #3 – Basement windows and area wells

To combat longstanding basement water infiltration, the applicant proposes to:

- a. retain previously bricked in openings;
- b. remove select historic windows and nonhistoric aluminum storm windows;
- c. remove mechanical equipment previously housed in window openings;
- d. label and retain removed historic windows onsite for future re-installation;
- e. brick in select openings with bricks matching the historic brick but inseting them several inches from the opening;
- f. preserve remaining historic wood windows and install new aluminum storm windows over them (to match the storm windows proposed for the remainder of the building);

The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* do not recommend blocking in window and door openings, but the persistence of water infiltration problems, even after city staff has implemented consultant-recommended solutions, appears to warrant such actions.

Scope of Work Item #4 – Windows

The applicant proposes to restore historic wood windows, retaining existing frame pieces unless dry rot warrants their replacement in-kind. This is in line with the rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* which do not recommend replacing an entire window when repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

The applicant also proposes to replace nonhistoric aluminum storm window frames and sashes with new aluminum storm window frames and sashes whose color and alignment match those of the historic wood windows (see storm window specification sheet following plan

sheets). This is in line with the rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* which do not recommend installing new exterior storm windows which are inappropriate in size or color. The applicant notes that detailed plans for the storm windows will be prepared with the window contractor. Staff recommends the project be conditioned to ensure the lengths and widths of storm window rails, stiles, and frames match those of the existing historic windows. While some window opening depth will be lost, since the historic windows will remain in place, the installation of metal storm windows on commercial buildings was a practice that came into being toward the end of the landmark's period of significance. While staff research has not yet confirmed that metal storm windows existed on all of this building's windows during the landmark's period of significance, a September 1939 letter in the job files of architects Liebenberg and Kaplan indicates that storm windows and screens on the building were repaired that year.

Scope of Work Item #5 – Main entrance doors, grills and sign, west wall (to include all handrails and guardrails/fencing at existing window wells and exterior stairways)

The applicant proposes to gently wash and repaint the main entrance's wood door, iron grills, and light fixtures. The applicant also proposes to replace mirrored transom window glass with clear glass. This is in line with the rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* which recommend protecting and maintaining the masonry, wood, and architectural metals that comprise entrances and porches through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems.

Additionally, the applicant wishes to gently wash and repaint the Grain Belt office sign currently hanging from a wood beam beneath the front entrance's arch. While the sign is nonhistoric, its reference to Grain Belt helps retain the building's integrity of association, and its cleaning and repainting is therefore considered acceptable.

The applicant is also proposing to replace all handrails and guardrails/fencing at existing window wells and exterior stairways (see plan sheet C-2), since the large openings in these minimal metal pipe features do not meet building code requirements. Only details of the proposed front (west) entrance stair handrail (see plan sheet A810) and deck handrail (see plan sheet A401) have been provided. No details have been provided for the other wells and stairways. The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* recommend replacing missing historic entrance components in-kind or with a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building. Staff recommends the project be conditioned to have the final window well and stairway handrails and guardrails/fencing be reviewed and approved by staff. Furthermore, staff recommends that the project be conditioned to ensure the proposed handrails utilize steel painted dark brown, rather than stainless steel, to better complement the existing metalwork at the front of the building. While the scope of work notes that the front (west) entrance handrail shall reuse existing handrail holes, the plans do not indicate this. Staff recommends that the project be conditioned to ensure all replaced handrails and guardrails/fencing reuse existing masonry anchoring points.

Scope of Work Item #6 – Exterior doors, north, east, and west walls

The applicant proposes to remove all of the nonhistoric steel and glass doors on the building and replace them with new aluminum frame and glass doors painted dark brown to match the existing trim on the building. The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* recommend replacing missing historic doors in-kind or with a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building. Staff research has not confirmed the appearance of historic doors on the building. A circa 1939 photograph of the rear of the building in the job files of architects Liebenberg and Kaplan indicates a three panel door with glass in its top half existed at the rear entrance at the time the photo was taken (see Attachment B). A September 1939 letter in that same file indicates that all doors on the building were in need of painting and scraping, indicating that the rear door in the photograph likely dates back to the landmark's period of significance. The proposed doors (see door panel elevation (X-)AL1 on plan sheet A830), does not replicate this design but, being simple, dominated by glass, and primarily utilizing materials available during the landmark's period of significance, the proposed door design appears compatible with the building's historic character.

Scope of Work Item #7 and 8– Steel exterior stairs, north wall

The applicant is proposing to remove two nonhistoric steel stairways at north side entrances. In the place of the westernmost stairway, the applicant proposes to install a dark brown painted steel staircase with a stainless steel and tempered glass handrail (plan sheet A810). The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* recommend replacing missing historic stairways in-kind or with a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building. Staff recommends that the proposed handrails utilize steel painted dark brown, rather than stainless steel, to better complement the existing metalwork at the front of the building. Staff also recommends that the project be conditioned to require new stairways reuse existing mounting points and/or be attached to the historic building through the mortar joints only.

In the place of the easternmost north side entrance stairway, the applicant proposes to install a dark brown painted steel deck and stairway. The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* recommend constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed. The low profile of the deck and its steel and tempered glass handrail will prevent it from obscuring much of the cream colored masonry walls: one of the building's character defining features. Staff recommends that the project be conditioned to require decking be affixed to the building through mortar joints only, not bricks or block.

The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* recommend new additions be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color. The dark brown painted steel deck structure will complement the character of the historic building by utilizing materials and colors (dark brown painted steel) evident in existing historic building materials. The tempered glass handrail components and the nature of the deck itself (highly irregular on an industrial office building) will clearly differentiate this addition from the historic

construction while meeting Building Code requirements and only minimally obscuring views of the historic building. Its placement at the rear of the site will further highlight this distinction, and is very much in keeping with the rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* which recommend placing a new addition on a non-character-defining elevation and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

Scope of Work Item #9 – Roofs

The applicant is proposing to replace in-kind flat EPDM roofs on the two projecting bays; the connector where the 1912 addition meets the 1893 building; and the portico. These roofs are highly deteriorated. Ceiling damage indicates the connector roof has been allowing water into the building for some time. On one projecting bay, plants sprout from the roof. The roof materials are clearly nonhistoric and not visible from the public right of way. The proposed in-kind replacement is in keeping with the rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* which recommend constructing a new feature when the historic feature is completely missing if the replacement feature is an accurate restoration or a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

Scope of Work Items #10 and 16 – Skylight and lay lights

The applicant is proposing to restore one of the exterior skylights in the 1912 addition. This skylight covers the barrel-vaulted stained glass lay light. The applicant proposes to use a Kalwall system, instead of glass, which would have originally been used in the skylight (Attachment C). Glass installation is feasible, as noted in the estimate provided by the applicant, but the applicant wishes to use Kalwall to save money. Estimates submitted by the applicant indicate that a Kalwall system would cost \$126,484 and a glass system would cost \$225,142 (see Attachment C). This appears to be a substantial cost differential, but the applicant has requested that forty percent of the cost of the substantial rehabilitation of the building be covered by federal and state historic preservation tax credits. After this savings, the proposed glass skylight would only cost \$135,085.20 – not even \$10,000 more than the full cost of the Kalwall system. The glass system is far more appropriate, from a preservation perspective, since glass would have originally been used in the skylight, but staff appreciates the applicant's efforts to restore the skylight.

Unfortunately, no such restoration is being proposed for the skylight which once stood above the flat lay light in the ceiling of the connector between the original building and the gable roofed addition. In this skylight, Kallwall would be considered an acceptable substitute material if cost were a serious issue, since the skylight would be shielded from public view by its placement behind two large walls and its position in the middle of a flat roof which has previously (and is proposed to) hold mechanical equipment. From a compatibility standpoint, staff could then see the rationale in having both skylights be made of a material not available during the landmark's period of significance. Staff recommends that the project be conditioned to require a glass skylight on the gabled roof of the 1912 addition unless both skylights are proposed to be restored.

The reestablishment of both openings seems especially appropriate given the other openings the applicant has requested be bricked in (see scope of work item #3). The restoration of both skylights also seems appropriate in light of the efforts the applicant is making to ensure the longevity of the lay lights. The applicant proposes to restore the lay lights, whose zinc connecting strips are beginning to fail, by removing, disassembling, cleaning, reinforcing (with steel brace bars in the lead joints) and reinstalling the lay lights. No details have been provided to demonstrate that the steel brace bars will not be visible, however, as the applicant contends. Staff recommends the project be conditioned to demonstrate, through scaled drawings, that the dimensions and placement of the proposed steel brace bars will not be visible when viewing the lay lights from the floor of the 1912 addition.

This portion of the scope of work also includes a proposal to replace the historic slate wall on the gable (west) end of the 1912 addition. This wall faces the back of the 1893 building. Its placement makes it difficult to see from the public right of way. Missing slate on this wall has been replaced with slate of new sizes and colors, resulting in a poor appearance (see applicant photo on page 22 of Attachment C, and staff photos in Attachment B). The remaining slate is also delaminating. The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* recommend that irreparable historic materials be replaced in-kind or with a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building. The replacement seems warranted, but synthetic slate was not available during the building's period of significance. Furthermore, the applicant has not demonstrated why new slate cannot be installed. Staff assumes that cost is the primary consideration, though no cost estimates were submitted for a natural slate installation. While natural slate is more appropriate, the limited views of this wall from the public right of way may make the use of synthetic slate acceptable, especially if additional cost savings can be used towards the restoration of one of the building's two most ornate features: the flat lay light and its accompanying skylight (which, unfortunately, is not proposed to be restored). Any new slate should match the historic slate in terms of size and color, however, the applicant does not provide these details. For these reasons, staff recommends that the project be conditioned to permit synthetic slate if the cost savings enables the flat lay light's skylight to be restored. Staff also recommends that the project be conditioned to ensure new slate matches the historic slate in terms of size and color.

Scope of Work Item #11 – Mechanical Equipment

The applicant proposes to install roof-mounted HVAC equipment on the 1893 building and the flat-roofed portion of the 1912 addition (see staff photos in Attachment B). Equipment is proposed to use existing equipment pads and proposed to be no higher than four feet. As mechanical plan sheets were not submitted with the proposal, staff recommends that the project be conditioned to ensure these details are reflected in the plans.

The equipment will be screened from view from the front of the building (thanks to placement and parapets) but will be more apparent to pedestrians and vehicular traffic on the north side of the building. Staff recommends that the project be conditioned to ensure no mechanical equipment is placed in the footprint of the former skylight that lit the flat lay light in the flat roofed portion of the 1912 addition.

Part II. Construct a plaza atop the subsurface remnants of the Orth Brewery (as depicted in all plan sheets from the cover to sheet L-2, with specific plan sheets and photographs indicated in the applicant's scope of work)

Scope of Work Items #12 and 13 – Landscaping and Plaza (to include site features)

On the site of the Orth Brewery the applicant is proposing a plaza designed to encapsulate the archaeological remnants of the Orth Brewery located 16-36" below grade. Rather than digging down, fill, sod, pavers, and scored concrete in stone, stack bond, and offset bond textures (see concrete specifications sheet following plan sheets) will be placed atop a heavy duty pond liner and 4" drain tile designed to protect the remnants. Proposed deciduous tree plantings have been moved outside of the area of significant archaeological features, and no buildings will be placed within the area of significant archaeological features identified in the 2006 and 2011 archaeological studies (Attachment B). This is very much in line with rehabilitation standard #8 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* which states that archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. Proposed freestanding signs designed to interpret the site's history will provide an added attraction to draw in visitors and hopefully foster pride in the neighborhood's heritage (plan sheet C-2, L-2).

Scored concrete of various colors and textures (see specification sheet following plan sheets in Attachment C) will delineate pathways from the outlines of the Orth Brewery buildings that once stood onsite (plan sheet C-2, L-2). Black and white plan sheets (plan sheet L-2 specifically) do not indicate the proposed colors of the scored concrete and pavers. For this reason, staff recommends that the project be conditioned to be earth-toned neutrals, such as buff and shades of brown (possibly a dark grey for accent), to reflect the palette of primary building colors evident on Grain Belt landmark buildings.

Neither the Development Objectives nor the applicant's proposal define their vision of a European plaza, but well-known plazas like Venice's Piazza di San Marco and Munich's Marienplatz don't rely upon grade changes or even landscaping to capture interest. They do, however, provide active commercial spaces at the plaza edges, and interesting buildings that provide good views of the plaza area. While the multi-family development proposed to border the plaza to the north won't feature commercial spaces, the applicant has added windows, balconies, and architectural features to what was previously a blank wall that concealed a parking garage. The addition of these architectural elements designed to break up the plane of the wall and provide active viewing of the plaza area will improve perceptions of safety onsite and provide visual interest. Proposed freestanding signs designed to interpret the site's history will provide an added attraction to draw in visitors and hopefully foster pride in the neighborhood's heritage.

The applicant is proposing to redesign and expand the unmarked parking area immediately north of the office building. Surrounding the parking lot will be landscaping that makes the site more attractive yet does not obscure views of the historic office building or brewhouse with excessively tall growth.

The applicant intends to install two types of lights onsite (see lighting specification sheets AA-BB and DD-EE which follow the plan sheets). The simple, functional design of both types of

lights will complement the historic building and new construction while not creating a false sense of history. Unfortunately, no attachment details have been provided. To ensure reversibility, staff recommends that the project be conditioned to ensure new lighting shall be attached to the historic building via mortar joints and/or existing masonry holes previously occupied by obsolete equipment proposed for removal in this application (see scope of work item #1).

The applicant also intends to install simple metal benches, metal trash cans, sitting walls, vegetation, bike racks, and other minor features designed to make the plaza and site more pedestrian friendly (plan sheets C1-C8, L1-L2). The simple, functional designs of these features will complement the historic building and new construction while not creating a false sense of history.

(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.

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 help preserve the historic building by replacing deteriorated components in-kind, most notably extensive sections of deteriorated tuckpointing. These actions will help ensure the property’s longevity and not impair the building’s integrity of design.

Implementation step 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. As conditioned, the project will not modify the building in ways that are insensitive to its historical character, as discussed in findings #4 and #5 above.

Comprehensive plan policy 8.3 states that the City will, “Explore and protect potential archeological resources in the city.” This includes implementation steps 8.3.2 (“Protect potential and known prehistoric, as well as 19th and 20th century archaeological sites and artifacts.”) and 8.3.3 (“Utilize existing identified sites, such as those associated with the city’s milling and industry along the riverfront, as examples for documentation and interpretation of archeological resources.”). The proposed encapsulation and interpretation of the site conforms to this policy and these action items.

(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's proposed rehabilitation of the office building and encapsulation of the archaeological remnants of the Orth brewery demonstrates that the applicant is considering not only the description and statement of significance in the original nomination form but also subsequent investigations that have taken place since.

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

The City Planning Commission will be reviewing the Site Plan Review application submitted on December 10, 2012.

(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 conditioned, the application complies with the rehabilitation guidelines of *the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* as discussed in finding #5 above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Department of Community Planning and Economic Development recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission adopt the findings above and **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness to rehabilitate the office building and construct a plaza at 1215 and 1219 Marshall Street Northeast subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed Prosoco masonry cleaning (beyond the proposed paint removal) is not permitted. Masonry surfaces may be cleaned with low pressure water and detergents, using natural bristle brushes.
2. The applicant shall submit test panels of the replacement brick, stone, and mortar to staff for review prior to the issuance of building permits for the repointing, stone replacement, and brick replacement.
3. The proposed replacement of gutters and downspouts shall only be permitted in areas that have not been subject to such treatment within the last three years.
4. Repointed mortar and joints shall match the color, size, texture, tooling, and strength of the historic mortar and joints on the building.
5. The lengths and widths of storm window rails, stiles, and frames shall match those of the existing historic windows.
6. Final window well and stairway handrails and guardrails/fencing shall be reviewed and approved by staff.
7. Proposed handrails shall utilize steel painted dark brown, rather than stainless steel, to match extensive metalwork at the front of the building.
8. All replaced handrails and guardrails/fencing shall reuse existing masonry anchoring points.
9. New stairways shall reuse existing mounting points and/or be attached to the historic building through the mortar joints only.
10. Decking shall be affixed to the building through mortar joints only, not bricks or block.
11. The larger of the two skylights shall be glass unless both skylights are proposed to be restored, in which case Kalwall would be permitted for either or both.
12. Staff shall review and approve applicant-provided, scaled drawings that demonstrate that the dimensions and placement of the proposed steel brace bars will not be visible when the lay lights are viewed from the floor of the 1912 addition.
13. Synthetic slate may be used instead of natural slate if the flat lay light's skylight is restored using Kalwall or glass.
14. The proposed slate shall match the historic slate in terms of color and size.
15. New mechanical equipment shall use existing equipment pads or not be visible from the public right of way.
16. New mechanical equipment shall be no higher than four feet.
17. No mechanical equipment shall be placed in the footprint of the former skylight that lit the flat lay light in the flat roofed portion of the 1912 addition.
18. Plaza and pathway pavers and concrete shall be colored in earth-toned neutrals to reflect the palette of primary building colors evident on Grain Belt landmark buildings.
19. New lighting shall be attached to the historic building via mortar joints and/or existing masonry holes previously occupied by obsolete equipment proposed for removal in this application.
20. By ordinance, approvals are valid for a period of two years from the date of the decision unless required permits are obtained and the action approval is substantially begun and

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27590

proceeds in a continuous basis toward completion. Upon written request and for good cause, the planning director may grant up to a one year extension if the request is made in writing no later than January 15, 2015.

21. By ordinance, all approvals granted in this Certificate of Appropriateness shall remain in effect as long as all of the conditions and guarantees of such approvals are observed. Failure to comply with such conditions and guarantees shall constitute a violation of this Certificate of Appropriateness and may result in termination of the approval.
22. Community Planning and Economic Development Staff shall review and approve the final plans and elevations prior to building permit issuance.