

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
Certificate of Appropriateness
BZH-27652

Proposal: Request for Certificate of Appropriateness to construct an elevator addition at the Basilica of Saint Mary

Applicant: Miller Dunwiddie Architecture

Address of Property: 8 17th Street North (A.K.A. 88 17th Street North and 15 16th Street North)

CPED Staff and Phone: John Smoley, Ph.D., 612-673-2830

Date Application Deemed Complete: February 22, 2013

Public Hearing: March 19, 2013

Appeal Period Expiration: March 29, 2013

Ward: 7

Neighborhood Organization: Citizens for a Loring Park Community

Concurrent Review: n/a

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27652

CLASSIFICATION:	
Individual Landmark	Basilica of Saint Mary
Period of Significance	1907-
Criteria of Significance	Architecture & cultural history
Date of Local Designation	1986
Date of National Register Designation	1975
Applicable Design Guidelines	<i>The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i>

PROPERTY INFORMATION	
Current name	Basilica of Saint Mary
Historic Name	Basilica of Saint Mary
Current Address	8 17 th Street North (A.K.A. 88 17 th Street North and 15 16 th Street North)
Historic Address	8 17 th Street North (A.K.A. 88 17 th Street North and 15 16 th Street North)
Original Construction Date	1907-1913
Original Contractor	numerous
Original Architect	Emmanuel Louis Masqueray
Historic Use	Church
Current Use	Church
Proposed Use	Church

BACKGROUND:

The subject property is a Roman Catholic Church, significant for its Classical Revival and Baroque Revival architecture and its association with the religious efforts of the Catholic Church administered by Archbishop John Ireland.

Plans to construct a new facility to replace the Church of the Immaculate Conception were announced Christmas Day 1903. The old church, constructed in 1871 at Third Street and Third Avenue North, had been engulfed within the expanding warehouse and industrial district. In 1905 a one-block parcel on Hennepin Avenue was donated and became the future site of the new church. Emmanuel Louis Masqueray, architect of the new St. Paul Cathedral, was commissioned for the project. Exterior construction lasted for nearly six years, while interior construction was not fully complete until 1925, with significant features added as late as 1954.

The current proposal affects the rear of the rectory. This four-story, Mansard-roofed building was completed in 1927. Recent work on the building includes a 2012 portico restoration, the 2007 addition of an accessible ramp, the 2004 replacement of original windows on the first through third floors, a 2002 reroofing, and a 1999 storm window replacement.

SUMMARY OF APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL:

On behalf of the Basilica of Saint Mary, Kelly Mastin of Miller Dunwiddie Architecture proposes to construct a four-story, five-stop elevator addition on the rear of the rectory, behind the basilica.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Staff has received no comments from members of the public.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Findings as required by the Minneapolis Preservation Code:

The Minneapolis Department of Community Planning and Economic Development 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 building is significant for its Classical Revival and Baroque revival architecture as well as association with the religious efforts of the Catholic Church administered by Archbishop John Ireland. While the designation includes the rectory building, few details are given regarding its historic features, including any mention of significant interior features. The elevator addition is proposed to be placed at the rear of the rectory and basilica: the ideal location for additions to historic buildings. Being an exterior addition, the proposed elevator will affect fewer interior features than an interior elevator would.

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

As conditioned, the proposed work will not affect the building's integrity of location, setting, feeling, or association. The proposal will affect the building's integrity of design, materials, and workmanship, but only minimally and in ways that are in conformance with the Rehabilitation standards of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, which are designed to ensure alterations do not adversely affect the integrity of historic buildings.

(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 approved 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.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27652

The Applicant is conducting a rehabilitation of the subject property. *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* has ten rehabilitation standards. The application complies with all ten of the standards, as discussed below.

Rehabilitation standard #1 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* states that a property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. The buildings will continue to be owned and used by the Basilica. The proposed alterations will continue to improve the building's accessibility, in line with accessibility features added in 2007.

Rehabilitation standard #2 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* states that the historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided. The applicant proposes to alter historic materials and features, but only at the rear of the rectory: the side of the building least visible from the public right of way. Additionally, only 4 foot by eight foot wall sections on each floor will be removed to connect the elevator addition to the historic building (sheet HPC-9). Existing historic window openings, terra cotta banding, stone banding, and other features of the existing exterior wall that are proposed to be covered by the addition will be furred over during the new construction to conceal and preserve them instead of removing them. The exception to this is the deep cornice, which will be removed to allow for the new construction. Pieces of the terra cotta cornice that are in good condition will be salvaged for use in future repair work. Roof tiles in good condition will be reused on the elevator addition roof.

Rehabilitation standard #3 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* states that each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken. The proposal differentiates the new work from the old through the use of a green flat clay tile roof, rather than a green mansard clay tile roof; slightly smaller and slightly darker bricks; a simplified cast stone version of the stone cornice; and simplified cast stone banding at the third floor window head, as opposed to the terra cotta banding and dentils on the historic building.

Rehabilitation standard #4 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* states that changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved. The period of significance for the property is arguably 1907, when construction of the basilica began, to 1954, when the final features required to classify it as a basilica were added. There is no evidence that features installed beyond this date are historically significant in their own right, but even nonhistoric windows installed in 2004 and nonhistoric roof tiles installed in 2002 are proposed to be reused in the elevator addition.

Rehabilitation standard #5 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* states that distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved. The project, as proposed, will result in the removal of some historic features that demonstrate the workmanship that went into the building. The applicant proposes to alter historic materials and features, but only at the rear of the rectory: the side of the building least visible from the public right of way. Additionally, only 4 foot by eight foot wall sections on each floor will be removed to connect the elevator addition to the historic building. Existing

historic window openings, terra cotta banding, stone banding, and other features of the existing exterior wall that are proposed to be covered by the addition will be furred over during the new construction to conceal and preserve them instead of removing them. The exception to this is the deep cornice, which will be removed to allow for the new construction. Pieces of the terra cotta cornice that are in good condition will be salvaged for use in future repair work. Roof tiles in good condition will be reused on the elevator addition roof, as was done in a 2002 reroof of the building.

Rehabilitation standard #6 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* states that deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. The rectory is in excellent condition. No historic features are proposed for repair or replacement due to their deterioration.

Rehabilitation standard #7 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* states that chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used. No chemical or physical treatments designed to restore building materials are proposed.

Rehabilitation standard #8 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* states that archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken. Staff is aware of no archaeological resources onsite.

Rehabilitation standard #9 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* states that new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. Staff's compatibility analysis follows this format.

Destruction of Historic Materials and Features

The applicant proposes to alter historic materials and features, but only at the rear of the rectory: the side of the building least visible from the public right of way. Only a four foot by eight foot section of wall on each floor will be removed to create openings into the addition (sheet HPC-9). Remaining historic window openings, terra cotta banding, stone banding, and other features of the existing exterior wall will be furred over during the new construction to conceal and preserve them instead of removing them. These treatments will make reversing the proposed changes much easier than other possible connections, should the basilica seek to reverse these changes in the future. The exception to this is the deep cornice, which will be removed to allow for the new construction. Pieces of the terra cotta cornice that are in good condition will be salvaged for use in future repair work. Roof tiles in good condition that must be removed to create a top floor connection to the elevator addition will be reused on the elevator addition roof with new tiles designed to match the historic tiles.

Destruction of Spatial Relationships

The addition is proposed to be placed on the eastern (rear) side of the rectory at the rear of the basilica, where it is best screened from views from the public right of way. The addition's 10 foot x 21 foot footprint is vastly smaller than the footprint of the rectory, ensuring it remains subordinate to the historic construction.

Differentiating the New Work from the Old

The proposal differentiates the new work from the old through the use of a flat clay tile roof, rather than a mansard clay tile roof; slightly smaller and slightly darker bricks; a simplified cast stone version of the stone cornice; and simplified cast stone banding at the third floor window head, as opposed to the terra cotta banding and dentils on the historic building.

Compatibility with Historic Materials

The addition uses materials complementary to the rectory: slightly smaller and slightly darker bricks and cast stone designed to complement stone and terra cotta banding and dentils on the historic building. Other materials, such as green clay roof tiles, will match their historic counterparts.

Compatibility with Historic Features

The addition's pattern of openings (which match, apart from one set of recessed bricks designed to represent window openings that must remain closed due to elevator shaft code requirements), slightly offset height, simplified cast stone detailing, and use of extremely similar brick all complement the historic construction's appearance without creating a false sense of history. The flat-roof will give passers-by the most obvious hint that the proposed construction is an addition, but using green roof tiles to clad the walls of the upper story will complement the mansard roof of the historic building, since it is covered in matching tiles.

Compatibility with Historic Size

The addition is proposed to rise higher than the rectory, but by less than two feet. The additional height is required for equipment overruns above where the elevator services the top floor of the building. Additionally, the addition's height has been reduced since the applicant brought conceptual plans to staff.

Compatibility with Historic Scale

The scale of the existing and proposed construction matches. Indeed, the elevator addition is designed to convey passengers between floors of the historic construction with minimal disruption to the historic building, and it does so in part by matching the scale of the existing construction.

Compatibility with Historic Proportion

The proportion of the existing and proposed construction also matches. Both utilize the same size windows and window openings. Floor heights in the elevator addition are designed to match those in the historic building to ensure it is fully accessible.

Compatibility with Historic Massing

The new construction appears to employ massing complementary to the historic construction, being as wide as one bay which projects from either end of the building.

Rehabilitation standard #10 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* states that new addition and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired. Only a four foot by eight foot section of wall on each floor will be removed to create openings into the addition (sheet HPC-9). Remaining historic window openings, terra cotta banding, stone banding, and other features of the existing exterior wall covered by the new addition will be furred over during the new construction to conceal and preserve them instead of removing them. These treatments will make reversing the proposed changes much easier than other possible addition connections, should the basilica seek to reverse these changes in the future. The exception to this is the deep cornice, which will be removed to allow for the new construction, but the terra cotta cornice pieces will be stored for possible reuse in the future.

(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 landmark by adding a major accessibility feature to the least visible portion of the rectory, located behind the basilica.

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.

(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 reuse and covering of architectural features; alteration of the rear of the building; and use of appropriate materials indicates a sensitivity toward the property's ability to communicate historical significance.

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

The scope of work in this application does not trigger site plan review under Title 20 of the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances, Zoning Code, Chapter 530, Site Plan Review.

(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 in compliance with the rehabilitation standards of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

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 subject to the following conditions:

1. Final plans, elevations, details, material selections, and finish samples must be submitted to CPED Staff for final review and approval prior to any permits being issued.
2. By ordinance, approvals are valid for a period of two years from the date of the decision. 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 March 19, 2015.
3. 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.

Attachments:

1. Staff Report
2. Materials Submitted by CPED
 - a. Zoning map
3. Materials Submitted by Applicant
 - a. Project description
 - b. Photographs
 - c. Renderings
 - d. Additional information
 - e. Plans
4. Materials Submitted by Other Parties
 - a. Public comment letters