

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED)
Demolition of a Historic Resource
BZH-27802

Applicant: Thomas Nelson, 612-805-9369

Address of Property: 2108 Kenwood Parkway

CPED Staff: John Smoley, 612-673-2830

Date Application Deemed Complete: June 24, 2013

Public Hearing: August 6, 2013

Appeal Period Expiration: August 16, 2013

Ward: 7

Neighborhood Organization: Kenwood

Concurrent Review: N/A

BACKGROUND

The applicant seeks to demolish the building at 2108 Kenwood Parkway. The property was previously identified as a contributing resource in the Kenwood potential historic district, identified during a 1999 National Register of Historic Places evaluation. The property was not, however, recommend for further research to determine whether it was eligible for local designation or National Register listing in Mead and Hunt's July 2006 reconnaissance level survey of portions of the Calhoun-Isles area.

DESCRIPTION

The residence at 2108 Kenwood Parkway is a 2.5-story brick building designed in the Colonial Revival style. The building is laid out in a simple plan three bays wide by three bays deep. A hipped, composition shingle-clad roof with medium width, bracketed eaves caps the building. Hipped dormers sprout from the front and side slopes of the roof, while a brick chimney rises from the roof just south of its peak. Fenestration consists primarily of double hung wood windows covered by aluminum storm windows. A single story, flat roofed, open front porch with classical columns and a spindled balustrade spans the front of the building.

PROPOSED CHANGES

The applicant is proposing to demolish the building at 2108 Kenwood Parkway to create a yard, with plans to build a new residence at an indefinite date.

NECESSITY OF DEMOLITION

The Minneapolis Code of Ordinances, Title 23, Heritage Preservation, Chapter 599 Heritage Preservation Regulations states that before approving the demolition of a property determined to be an historic resource, the commission shall make findings that the demolition is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property, or that there are no reasonable alternatives to the demolition. 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 up to one hundred-eighty (180) days to allow parties interested in preserving the historic resource a reasonable opportunity to act to protect it.

UNSAFE OR DANGEROUS CONDITION

The Applicant does not contend that the demolition of the subject property is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition.

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES TO DEMOLITION

Reasonable alternatives to demolition exist. The home can continue to be used as a residence: a permitted use in the property's R2B zoning district. The home, however, is in need of work, and the applicant wishes to use the property as a yard for his family's adjacent residence, immediately south of the subject property.

SIGNIFICANCE

The subject property does not appear eligible for designation as a landmark.

Criterion 1. The property is associated with significant events or with periods that exemplify broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history.

The property does not appear significant under criterion 1. The property does not appear to have been the site of significant historical events. The property received little mention in early twentieth century newspaper reports, though social page notes did detail minor events held onsite by occupants.

Criterion 2. The property is associated with the lives of significant persons or groups.

The property does not appear significant under criterion 2. The residence was built in 1902 by architect and builder Hulen R. Adkinson. Adkinson lived and worked in Minneapolis for a very short period of time: 1901-1906. He is identified as one of over one hundred fifty carpenters listed in city directories from that time. Newspaper reports from that time do mention Adkinson (occasionally spelled "Adkison"), but very few times and only in reference to minor building news. Original owner William Bishop does not appear to have lived onsite, as his residence continued to be identified as a nearby residence in city directory listings. In 1903 or 1904 James Prodger assumed ownership of the property. Both Bishop and Prodger were realtors. Neither

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27802

appears to be significant within the context of Minneapolis' real estate history. The subsequent owner was only slightly more prominent.

Albert Haines purchased 2108 Kenwood Parkway in 1904. Haines is best remembered for his commercial partnership with his brother-in-law. Beginning with wood shingle and lath fabrication in 1882, the pair expanded into hay press (baler) equipment manufacturing in 1889 and tractor engine production in 1904. While the company was successful, Haines was clearly the junior partner. Newspaper reports detailing the firm's accomplishments quote Kinnard and credit him with the company's advances, whereas Haines tends to appear in the company's name, and even then only at times. When Kinnard served as president, Haines served as secretary and treasurer. When Haines left the company in 1917, Kinnard soldiered on. In any event, the significance of Kinnard, Haines, and their contributions to Minneapolis' agricultural implement manufacturing and sales history has already been preserved in the company's former office building at 826 44th Avenue North, designated as a landmark in 1995.

Subsequent owners Albert Baston (an automobile dealership owner), Daniel Brennan (an author), and W. Timothy Peterson (a photographer) and their families do not appear to have figured prominently in Minneapolis' history.

Criterion 3. The property contains or is associated with distinctive elements of city or neighborhood identity.

The property does not appear significant under criterion 3. The building is a single family residence in a neighborhood comprised primarily of single family residences. Neither the building's size nor its design or function distinguish it from other residences in the neighborhood or the city, where single family residences are the most common building type.

Criterion 4. The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural or engineering type or style, or method of construction.

The subject property is a 2.5-story building designed in the Colonial Revival style. While the design is attractive, better remaining examples of the style exist in the seven residences designated for their embodiment of Colonial Revival architecture, five of which were constructed during the same decade as the subject property. Additionally, numerous other examples of this style are preserved as contributing resources in designated historic districts.

Criterion 5. The property exemplifies a landscape design or development pattern distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness or quality of design or detail.

The lot in question possesses commonplace shrubs, trees, and grass. These elements are not part of a unified landscape design.

Criterion 6. The property exemplifies works of master builders, engineers, designers, artists, craftsmen or architects.

While the subject residence was designed and constructed well enough to have lasted over a century, its designer and builder, H.R. Adkinson, does not appear to have been a master builder, if lack of critical acclaim from peers and periodicals is any indication. In any event, the subject property does not exemplify the work of a master builder. The subject property has few architectural flairs, the most notable being, arguably, classical columns on the porch. No evidence exists that would suggest that the builder made those columns himself.

Criterion 7. The property has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Although the property lies within one thousand feet of a known prehistoric water source, the character of water source was altered dramatically with severe dredging in the late 1800s. Chances of significant archaeological remains being on site are not high enough to warrant an archaeological survey of the site.

INTEGRITY

The subject property retains the integrity required to be a contributing resource in the Kenwood potential historic district.

Location: The building remains in its original location, indicating the building maintains integrity of location.

Design: The building's design has been minimally altered since its date of construction, most notably through the addition of a small, one story porch in 1992. Its wood siding, small size, and location at the rear of the home make this porch quite compatible with the building's design.

Setting: The property's integrity of setting remains intact. The building continues to operate among other residences clustered around the lake, as it has done throughout its history.

Materials: The majority of the building's original exterior materials remain, to include its brick cladding, wood windows, and stone sills.

Workmanship: Integrity of workmanship is especially evident in the existing exterior wood features such as the columns, porch balustrade, and bracketed wood eaves.

Feeling: The building continues to appear and serve as a single family residence.

Association: The building continues to be associated with Kenwood's early residential development.

ECONOMIC VALUE OR USEFULNESS OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURE

The Applicant has not demonstrated that the building in question has no economic value or usefulness. The Hennepin County Assessor lists the building's value as \$379,200, but similarly sized residences to the south are valued at one and one-half to two times as much. The applicant has noted that the home needs extensive repairs, but has not provided itemized cost estimates for these repairs. In any event, the home is not compatible with the proposed immediate use of the land: a yard.

PUBLIC COMMENT

As of the date of publication of this staff report, staff has received no comments regarding the project.

FINDINGS

1. The property was previously identified as a contributing resource in the Kenwood potential historic district, but this district has neither been nominated for designation nor placed under interim protection.
2. The property has not been designated and does not appear to individually meet any of the designation criteria listed in section 599.210, thus the subject property does not appear to be eligible for individual designation as a local landmark.
3. The demolition is not necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property.
4. Reasonable alternatives to demolition exist.
5. The building retains integrity.
6. The Applicant has not demonstrated that the building in question has no economic value or usefulness.
7. The commission may delay a final decision for up to 180 days to allow parties interested in preserving the historic resource a reasonable opportunity to act to protect it.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

CPED recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission adopt staff findings and **approve** the demolition of the property at 2108 Kenwood Parkway.

ADVISORIES

1. 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 August 6, 2015.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-27802

Attachments:

1. Staff report
2. Vicinity map
3. Statement of proposed use and description of project
4. Plans
5. Photos of property
6. Determination of eligibility study prepared by Landscape Research